Baconiana.

VOL. IX.—*New Series.* OCTOBER, 1901. No. 36.

EMBLEMS FROM NATURE USED BY "BACON" AND "SHAKESPEARE."

THE question was once asked at a conclave of literary friends, "How did 'Shakespeare' study natural history?" The answer came pat, "There is no need to suppose that he *studied* it at all; of course he acquired his knowledge of creatures merely by observation." The statement was cheerfully accepted by the majority of hearers, because "of course" settles so much.

Were the same question put to any mixed company with regard to "Bacon," the reply would probably be the same. *There is no reason to suppose that he studied it at all;* or, grant that his knowledge of natural science included (as we know that it did include) some disjointed and incidental acquaintance with the habits of animals, it would yet be considered improbable that he went deeply into the subject, or that he had any special aim in the desultory notes which he jotted in connection with it. The present paper is written merely to suggest another view of the matter, which is far too extensive to be duly treated in a few pages.

All that can here be attempted is to show "Bacon's" notes in the *Sylva Sylvarum* and elsewhere to be no haphazard jottings, but made with a definite and persistent purpose. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they have a *double* purpose, and are "ambiguous as oracles,"* being in fact part of the method whereby he would "mingle heaven and earth," teach parables from nature, as bringing within the comprehension of the simple and unlearned things beyond the reaches of their souls.

Certain of these natural objects our philosopher intended to use as symbols in the hieroglyphic pictures which were to adorn his books, and to be recognisable by his *Invisible Brotherhood.* These emblems or symbolic devices were ever to recall to their minds the fundamental principles which he

* Promus 444.

repeatedly charged them to "remember," and the axioms which as he declared were "drawn from the centre of the sciences."

It is true that nowhere in "Bacon's" *acknowledged* works is there anything approaching to a treatise on natural history. "It was not my aim," he says, "to heap up names, to make lists of genera and species," for "this field has been already sufficiently laboured."* In his own natural history he did not "labour;" on the contrary, dry particulars are omitted or only set down when they contribute something to his Method and to his New Philosophy Made Easy. From the first he calls in his intuitive genius—that "nimbleness of mind and aptness to see analogies" with which in early life he perceived himself to be more than commonly endowed. This quick sense of the likeness and unlikeness of things is the very gift of the poet, the spring and source of all metaphors, similes, and figurative language.

"Man," says the philosopher, "being the servant and interpreter of nature, can do and understand so much, and so much only, as he has observed in fact or thought in the course of nature; beyond this he neither knows anything nor can do anything. But," adds the poet, "neither the naked hand nor the understanding left to itself can effect much. It is by instruments and helps that the work is done—instruments and helps which are as easy for the mind as for the hand. And as the instruments of the hand either give motion, or guide it, so the instruments of the mind supply it with suggestions and cautions."

We see that our poet-philosopher makes no account of heaven-born geniuses, mighty writers who can discourse profoundly or in sublime language on every subject without needing instruction or "helps" like ordinary mortals. In his First Book of the *Novum Organum* he discourses about these helps; but the Second Book advances to a discussion of the causes of effects and defects in nature, in order to reach a just understanding of the forms," or innate qualities of things. He illustrates his meaning by "instances" drawn from his own experiments on heat and flame, dividing these instances into three classes—the constant and universal, the "solitary" or exceptional, and the "hidden" and hard to find. The con-

* We may profitably seek for and identify the "*collections*" of genera and species, such as "Bacon" elsewhere pronounced deficient, but of whose existence he was evidently aware, and with good reason, since he also says that he had *never found a deficiency which he had not endeavoured to supply.*

stant instances are said to "rule or govern," and amongst these he places "*instances of analogy, which I also call parallels or physical resemblances.*" "These analogies, the first and lowest steps towards the union of nature, . . . are very useful in revealing the fabric of the parts of the universe and anatomising its members; from this they often lead us to sublime and noble axioms." He goes on to expound what is truly the old Paracelsian doctrine of the sympathies between animate and inanimate bodies, and the "vital spirits" in nature. "Men's labour," he says, "should be turned to the investigation and observation of *the resemblances and analogies of things, as well in whole as in parts*, for these it is that detect the unity of nature."

It is clear that Francis Bacon esteemed the art of detecting analogies, not as a result of chance observation, but as a matter for serious study and "labour." Later in life he wrote "The Wisdom of the Ancients," a little book in which he interpreted and illustrated, after a fashion entirely his own, many of the mythological fables of the Greeks. In the Preface (*which should be more widely read and considered*) he repeats and enforces previous remarks upon the importance of analogies, comparisons, allusions, parables and allegories, for "*parables serve as well to instruct and illustrate, as to wrap up and envelop*, and every man of any learning must readily allow that the method of instructing by parables and figures is grave, sober, and exceedingly useful, sometimes necessary, in teaching rude and unlettered men. It opens an easy and familiar passage to the human understanding in those who cannot apprehend matters of subtlety and speculation. As hieroglyphics were in use before writing, so were parables before arguments."

Fluellen observes that there are "comparisons between Macedon and Monmouth," that there is a river in each, and salmons in both, and many analogies between Alexander and Harry, "for there is *figures in all things.*" So Francis declares that "in the first ages . . . *all things abounded with fables, parables, similes, comparisons and allusions*, which were not intended to conceal, but to inform and teach."

Who will doubt, after reading that Preface, that the writer (who always practised as he preached) made large use of figurative teaching? The books of his day and of the kind which he found "deficient" are sufficient proof of the value which he set upon emblems and allegories. For the present we can only notice the hieroglyphics or "speaking pictures"

which meet us in Baconian books, chiefly in the head-lines and tail-pieces at almost every turn. Here, although the creatures represented are few, we may yet gather useful particulars and hints as to the nature and aim of the notes in the Natural History; for the unanimity of the Baconian designers is remarkable, and no doctrine of chances will explain it.

Wherever our books concern Francis Bacon, either directly or indirectly, whether they were printed in England or abroad, whether published 300 years ago or in this year 1901, certain creatures, and none other, will be found in the designs and book-ornaments. Common-sense satisfies us that there was, *and is*, co-operation amongst the artists and craftsmen—some method faithfully, and of fixed purpose, transmitted from one to another unto the present day.

The creatures and objects in these designs are easily explainable by comparing them with the scanty notes in the *Sylva Sylvarum*, and with their innumerable *figurative* applications throughout the vast literature now claimed for Francis St. Alban; yet his notes were not printed until fifty years after the time when the designs in question had begun their mission of *concealing* and at the same time *revealing*.

Turning to the hieroglyphic pictures, it seems best to classify their component parts, so let us begin with the quadrupeds, observing by the way that, from the works of travellers, from bills of fare and accounts of banquets in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., the names of 850 creatures have been collected—beasts, birds, fishes, reptiles, insects. Of these "Bacon" notes 165, or not one-sixth of those known to the educated world of his time.

The following are the four-legged creatures honoured by his notice:—

Ape (baboon, marmozet, monkey)
Ass

Badger
Bear
Boar
Bull (cow, calf, kine, buffle)

Camel
Cat
Coney (rabbit)

Deer (stag, roe, hart, &c.)
Dog (hound, mastiff, spaniel, &c., &c.)
Dormouse

Elephant

Ferret

Fox

Goat (kid)

Hare
Hedge-hog (porcupine)
Hog (pig, sow, swine)
Horse (jennet, palfrey, hackney, &c., &c.)
Hyena

Leopard
Lion

Mole
Mouse
Mule
Musk cat (civet)

Otter
Panther
Pole-cat

Rat

Sheep (ram, &c.)
Squirrel

Tiger

Wolf

Every one of these animals is mentioned in *Shakespeare* excepting the badger; and, on the other side, *Shakespeare* speaks of no other quadrupeds than these, except it be the weasel, perhaps classed as a ferret, and the rhinoceros, which some writers consider to be the unicorn, at that time a semi-mythical creature spoken of with awe. (See *Jul. Cæs.* ii. 1; *Tim. Ath.* iv. 3; *Temp.* iii. 3.)

But the point of interest does not lie so much in the fact that the lists of animals from the scientific works and from the poetry coincide, but from the insight which in study of this kind we gain into the writer's thoughts and aims. These differ from the aims and thoughts of ordinary men, for it must be plain even to a purblind eye that nearly everything common to ordinary treatises on natural history is absent from the notes and from the plays. As a rule, creatures of every order—beasts, birds, fish, reptiles, insects —are regarded chiefly with a view to their "affinities" or resemblance in the first place to each other, but next (and especially in the plays) because of further analogies to be perceived between them and men—their human prototypes. Whilst observing such resemblances, the author also notes the "contraries" or differences:—"As in the frame of nature there are great diversities and strong resemblances, so it is likewise with beasts. Dogs have some affinity with wolves and foxes, horses with asses, kine with buffles, hares with coneys, &c., and so with birds."

And are not these "affinities" precisely those observed and utilised by "Shakespeare" when he puts into the mouth of Edgar a description of himself?

"False of heart, light of ear, bloody of hand; hog in sloth, fox in stealth, wolf in greediness, dog in madness, lion in prey" (*Lear* iii. 4).

In the witches' cauldron, "tongue of dog, and tooth of wolf" are thrown together, and with the latter, "scale of dragon," which reminds us of how Timon similarly associates, "Tigers, *dragons*, *wolves*, and bears" (*Tim. Ath.* iv. 3).

"The wolf," says Bacon, "is a beast of great edacity and digestion. . . . Dogs have an affinity with wolves and foxes" (*Sylva Sylvarum*). A character abundantly illustrated in the poetic and allegoric literature of the period. Here are a few instances from *Shakespeare.*

"To wake a *wolf* is as bad as to smell a *fox*" (2 *Hen. IV.* i. 2).

"Thou damn'd inexorable *dog* . . . thy *currish* spirit

governed by a *wolf* . . . thy desires are *wolfish, starved, and ravenous*" (*Mer. Ven.* iv. 1).

Buckingham has so filled his mind with Baconian affinities of the wolf, dog, and fox, that in discussing Cardinal Wolsey with the Duke of Norfolk he continually brings them forward to emphasise his condemnation of the Cardinal's cruel, rapacious, and cunning character :—

"This *butcher's cur* is venom-mouthed. . . . This holy *fox, or wolf, or both, for he is equal ravenous as he is subtle,* and as prone to mischief as able to perform it. This *cunning* Cardinal has done this . . . which is *a kind of puppy* to the old dam, treason" (*Hen. VIII.* i. 1). Again in *Tr. Cr.* v. 4, "that dissembling varlet Diomed" is compared with "that same *dog-fox,* Ulysses, that *mungrel cur,* Ajax, as bad *a dog* as Achilles."

We cannot fail to perceive that the old-world symbolism, which lingered in illuminated missals, painted windows, and ecclesiastical art until mediæval times, disappears when Francis St. Alban takes up the pen of a ready writer. In the mythology of ancient India and Greece, the wolf was an emblem of light and truth. Pluto (the Invisible) is fabled to have carried off Leuke (a she-wolf—the Holy Spirit) and the Nymph Mentha (Men Th., the moon or dove) both of whom were changed into beautiful plants now abiding in the Elysian fields—an allegory of the ascent and resurrection of the soul into a condition of light and loveliness or beauty.* It is thought probable that the legend of the she-wolf bringing up Romulus was a fable expressing the rearing of the future founder of the Roman State under the care of some great and venerable teacher of wisdom and religion. The Evangelist, St. Luke, bore a typical name (*Lukos,* a wolf) and he is in many ancient pictures drawn as if writing at the dictation of a Bull, symbol of the Deity, thus representing to the uninitiated an idea of a teacher writing under the immediate inspiration of God Himself.†

* See *The Book of God* ii. 620. Tor Anga (the Japanese cabir or messenger) has a temple at the four corners of which are Bulls of the Sun. At the back of his altar is a pillar on which a wolf (God and Light) is represented, behind it is a Hind with a lovely female head—the Holy Spirit. Peter Martyr notices that the Chinese word for God is Hu—a wolf.

† It may be observed that in the comparatively rare instances where "savage beasts" are introduced into the hieroglyphic designs, head and tail pieces &c. of Baconian books, the *ancient* symbolism is adopted. "Bacon's" parabolic teaching, like his arguments, usually considered both sides of every subject, and only the good and the beautiful were admitted in those designs.

The "Authentic Works of Bacon" fail to give any *verbal* hint of these things, which had certainly been "in the air" for many centuries. In *writing*, he and all his school turn aside, once and for all, from the ancient notions in connection with the wolf and adopt him as a type of insatiable desire, inexorable cruelty.

Elsewhere the "affinities" are extended and illustrated in leopards, bears, and lions, but the method is still the same. Timon, ordering off Alcibiades, desires him to "get away and take his *beagles* with him, calling upon the earth no more to bring forth ungrateful man, but "tigers, dragons, wolves, and bears, new monsters," his superiors.

Faithless Cressida, stringing together similitudes for herself should she prove untrue to Troilus, chooses her illustrations from these same creatures on account of their affinities and contrarieties to human nature. "*As false as fox* to lamb, as *wolf* to heifer's calf, *pard* to the hind or step-dame to her son" (*Tr. Cr.* iii. 2).

The early Play of 1 *Hen. VI.* i. 6, has a passage in which the fierceness of dogs, lions, wolves, and leopards, are compared to the spirit of the English soldiers, and in *Cymbeline* iii. 3, the distinction which "Bacon" and "Shakespeare" repeatedly draw between the beast, and the man endowed with reason and knowledge, and with the power of exercising and expressing them, are plainly shown in the regret of Guiderius.

> We have seen *nothing*,
> We are *beastly: subtile as the fox for prey;*
> *Like warlike as the wolf, for what we eat,*
> Our valour is to chase what flies; our cage
> We make a quire, as doth the prison'd bird,
> *And sing our bondage freely.*

We feel sorry for Guiderius; his mind to him a prison is; he knows that there must be things worth seeing and knowing, which he cannot see, and he feels "beastly," little superior to the wolf, the fox, or the caged bird.

In Hindu mythology little distinction is drawn between the leopard and panther, the tiger and cat. All signified a "cabir" or heavenly messenger. In the caves of Elephanta a figure of a tiger circled with a wreath of lotus flowers signifies that notwithstanding his fierce exterior he bears a message of love to mortals. So in another temple dedicated to Aduant, the Egyptian Adonis, a tiger's head is carved in

high relief with the mouth extended, a scroll of flowers passing through it—an emblem similar to the former. The ancient mystics then did not regard tigers merely as savage beasts, blood-thirsty, merciless. They could associate the idea of a tiger with sweetness and love,* of a leopard with the all-cheering sun; they could represent their heavenly messenger as mounted upon a tiger or a panther. In paper-marks, sometimes in hieroglyphic designs, and not infrequently in Church symbolism the panther was retained as a sacred emblem. But when Francis "awaked antiquity," he re-adjusted and altered, as we have seen, much of the ancient object teaching. The tiger, emblem of the sun, is suddenly bereft of his divine attributes, and destined for the future to figure selfish rapacity and ferocity.

"Tigers are prettily feigned to draw the chariot of Bacchus; for as soon as any affection shall, from going on foot be advanced to ride, *it triumphs over reason and exerts its cruelty, fierceness, and strength against all that oppose it.*"†

"*Beggars mounted run their horse to death.* . . .

"*O tiger's heart* ‡ . . . *more inhuman* . . . *more inexorable than tigers of Hyrcania.*"§

This is the tone throughout the Elizabethan literature; in no single instance is virtue or goodness in any form attributed to a tiger. Lavinia entreats the ferocious queen. "O Tamora, thou bear'st a woman's face," but well she knows of the tigerish heart beneath, and when one of the sons is inclined to argue with his mother, Lavinia adds:—"When did the tiger's young ones teach the dam . . . even at thy teat thou hadst thy tyranny."

"That heinous tiger Tamora" at her death is to be thrown forth to beasts and birds of prey. "Her life was beast-like, and devoid of pity."

In the same Play Aaron is termed "this barbarous Moor, this ravenous tiger, this accursed devil." (See *Tit. And.* ii. 3, and v. 3). Elsewhere the wolf is compared to his disadvantage with the lion, or associated with the bear, or contrasted with the lamb, the heifer, and other gentle creatures. Let us turn to these milder creatures.

"Horses and asses have some affinity." Here again we take note that in ancient times very high ideas were con-

* This reminds us of Blake's lines:—"Tiger, tiger burning bright, In the darkness of the night."—ED.

† Ess., Bacchus. ‡ See a passage in Bushell's letter (BACONIANA, April, 1901). § 3 *Hen. VI.* i. 4.

nected with both horse and ass. Both were solar emblems, and the Typhonian ass was consequently a bearer of the sacred Ark, the "mysteries" of the Divine Spirit. In like manner the horse was an emblem of the fiery horses, horses of the sun, and similar symbols in the Bible, and in the writings of antiquity, may all be taken as kindred allusions to the soul or sublime Spirit. But such allusions are rare in the Plays. The glory of the horse had departed (the muses were poor and barren), and the Poet (in popular pieces) generally uses the word *horse* as a term of reproach. "Spit in my face, and call me, horse" (1 *Hen. IV.* ii. 4). "I am a pepper-corn, a *brewer's horse*" (*Ib.* iii. 3).

When Armado, the fantastical Spaniard in *Love's Labours Lost*, desires his page, Moth, to fetch Costard the clown, that he may convey a letter, the pert page exclaims, "A message *well sympathised! A horse* to be ambassador for an *ass.*" Armado bristles up, suspecting that Moth means Armado himself for the ass, and Moth for the messenger horse. But the page adroitly turns away wrath by insinuating that he, Moth, is the horse sent to summon the slower drudge, Costard:—

"Marry, sir, you must send the *ass* upon the *horse*, for he is very slow-gaited. But *I go.*" A similarly contemptuous contrast is made when Lear, preparing to quit the house of the Duke of Albany, asks impatiently:—"Be my *horses* ready?" "Thy *asses* are gone about them," replies the fool, who like others of his kind is not such a fool as he looks. When Goneril takes upon her to lecture her old father, the privileged fool again puts in his word:—

"May not an *ass* know when the cart draws the *horse?*"

Lear compares his dear daughter Cordelia, her sweetness and fate, with the happier lot of the most despised creatures:—"No life! Why should a dog, a *horse*, a rat have life, and thou no breath at all?"

In the *Promus* is a Spanish proverb, which translated, runs thus:—"*I had rather take the ass which will carry me, than the horse which will throw me off.*" This Spanish proverb reappears in *Richard II.* where the deposed king laments the supposed faithlessness of his favourite horse. The lines end thus:

"Forgiveness, horse! Why do I rail on thee?
. . . . I was not made a *horse*,

And yet I bear a burthen like an *ass.*"*

Here the last line connects with another *Promus* entry; this time a French proverb:—"*L'asne qui porte le vin et boit l'eau.*"

Dr. Wordsworth puts a note to "*the brewer's horse*" (in 1 *Hen. IV.*) "*which carries malt liquor but does not drink it.*" In later plays the thoughts suggested by both proverbs are more fully developed.

Much more would we say of the horse as a solar emblem but that he is chiefly associated with the Pegasus, and thus becomes ranged amongst the mythical creatures of whom, at some future time, we may perhaps be allowed to say somewhat. Meanwhile, it is interesting to see that our poet was aware of the connection, in Hindu mythology, between the horse as the sun or solar messenger, and the hawk or the sun (God) the crest of Osiris. He must also have been acquainted with the strange way in which the *horse-shoe* had become associated not only with the bearer of heavenly music or of the harmonies of Orpheus† and with the ancient legends of the messengers of God who rode "fire-red" horses‡ supported and borne by the sun, the fiery source of spirit life. These magnificent emblems became corrupted and turned to idolatry,§ but as symbols Francis perceived their beauty and utility and we cannot doubt that he derived his ideas chiefly from Pythagoras (much of whose method and symbolism is woven into modern "speculative" masonry) but also from Iamblichus. He describes the light and air in which celestial objects are made manifest to those whose God uplifts in spirit to His spheres as of so subtle a nature that corporeal eyes are not able to see it, but men who can behold this Divine fire scarce breathe, their spirit becoming enclosed in fire. And, now, without pressing the subject further, we ask you to consider the following passage and to see if it be not true that its author had indeed well studied the "Wisdom of the Ancients," so that he could make it serve his own purposes and show forth

* *Rich. II.* v. 5. A much longer passage to the same effect is in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* v. 4, 50—52, a play which, for reasons inscrutable, has, with *Edw. III.*, been picked from a mass of others, equally Baconian, and added, in some editions, to the regular canon of *Shakespeare* plays.

† Lines drawn across the *horse-shoe* (originally the *Omega*) converted it into a lyre, another emblem of the Holy Spirit—the lyre of the Messianic Apollo.

‡ Enoch, the second messenger, is represented as thus riding. He was also called Ur-anous, or "the fire of the mind," the "Spirit," the "Word" of God.

§ See of Josiah removing the horses and burning the chariots of the sun.—2 Kings xxiii. 11.

the beauties of his beloved horse, his mistress, sublime Poetry—

Orleans. You have an excellent armour, but let my horse have his due.

Constable. It is the best horse in the world . . .

Dauphin. . . . I will not change my horse with any but that treads on four pasterns. *Ca ha!* He bounds from the earth as if his entrails were hairs: *le cheval volant,* the Pegasus, *qui a les narines de feu.* When I bestride him *I soar, I am a hawk; he trots the air; the earth sings when he touches it: the basest horn of his hoof is more musical than the pipe of Hermes.*

Orleans. He's of the *colour of the nutmeg.*

Dauphin. And of the *heat of ginger.* It is a beast for Perseus.* He is pure air and fire; and the dull elements of earth and water never appear in him, but only in patient stillness, while his rider mounts him: he is indeed a horse; and all other jades you may call beasts.

Constable. Indeed, my Lord, it is a most absolute and excellent horse.

Dauphin. It is the prince of palfreys: his neigh is like the bidding of a monarch, and his countenance enforces homage.

Orleans. No more, cousin.

Dauphin. Nay, the man hath no wit that cannot, from the rising of the lark to the lodging of the lamb, vary deserved praise on my palfrey: it is a theme as fluent as the sea; turn the sands into eloquent tongues, and my horse is argument for them all. It is a subject for a sovereign to reason on, and for a sovereign's sovereign to ride on; and for the world (*familiar to us, and unknown*) to lay apart their particular functions, and wonder at him. I once writ a sonnet in his praise, and began thus: "Wonder of Nature!"

Orleans. I have heard a sonnet begin so to one's mistress.

Dauphin. Then did they imitate that which I composed to my courser; *for my horse is my mistress.*"

To return to our ass, once "onos" or "ora," the sun, and venerated by the Jews. He, like the horse, fell from his high estate under the powerful pen of our poet. In future his fate is to figure as an emblem of patient drudging or dullness.

> "*He shall bear honours as the ass bears gold,*
> *To groan and sweat under the business . . .*

* A Messianic name; sometimes described as Hermes, sometimes as Apollo. His career is one of pure beneficence.

Having brought our treasures where we will,
Then take we down our load to turn him off,
Like to the empty ass, to graze on commons."*

In *Othello* we read of the good servant who

"Wears out his time, *much like his master's ass*
For nought but provender."†

and in *Measure for Measure*, the Duke, trying to persuade Claudio with arguments drawn from the "Anatomy of Melancholy," that life is really not worth living, uses these words—

"If thou art rich, thou'rt poor,
For, *like an ass whose back with ingots bows,*
Thou bear'st thy heavy riches but a journey,
And death unloads thee."‡

The dull slowness of the ass is the affinity which links him in "Baconian" poetry to the stupid, plodding man of whom he was henceforward to be the type. In spite of many honourable traditions in his favour, one still older and apparently (like many other emblems which concern us) coming from Egypt, represents the ass as a type of stupidity and ignorance; the Egyptians saw in him the image of the *uninitiated* or *profane*, and it is evident that Francis in his emblem-writings adopted these disparaging views of the poor donkey. He was stupidity incarnate. So when the clown is posed by the riddle "*Who builds stronger than a mason?*" and, after some puzzling, answers (in a form which we recognise) "*I cannot tell*"—his fellow counsels him to give it up:—"*Cudgel thy brains no more about it, for your dull ass will not mend his pace with beating.*" §

Nearly eighty references to the ass in Shakespeare are set in the same key, and here and there the idea is reflected which is prominently put forward in the Essay of "Prometheus," that "*slow and sure*" must go together, for the essayist adds particulars about a "light bird" and a "sluggish tortoise," to help out his comparison of *experience* to "the heavy, dull, lingering thing" upon whose back were placed the inestimable gifts brought down from heaven by Prometheus. "Reasoning and experience," he says, "are to be laid, the one upon the back of a light bird—abstract philosophy—and the other

* *Jul. Cæs.* iv. 3. See *Rom. Jul.* ii. 5, 73—76. *Mer. Ven.* iv. 1, 90—98.
† *Oth.* i. 1. ‡ *M. M.* iii. 1.
§ Comp.: Dogberry in *M. Ado*, "Write me down an ass," &c.

upon *an ass, or slow-paced practice and trial*, and good hopes might be conceived of this ass, if it were not for his thirst, and for the accidents of the way."

Other slow creatures, the camel, the elephant, and the ox, are used as types of the same kind as the ass, though with characteristic differences. The camel is not only slow, but stubborn; and, consequently, an object of contempt. Pandarus, wishing to depreciate Achilles to Cressida, calls him "a drayman, a porter, a very camel,"* and Thersites, after Ajax, has called him "cur," and "dog," beating him, returns full measure.

"Ay, do, do; thou sodden-witted lord! thou hast no more brain than I have in my elbows—*an assinego may tutor thee, thou scurvy-valiant* ass . . . thou art bought and sold amongst those that have any wit, like a barbarian slave . . . Mars his idiot; do, rudeness; do *camel*, do."

The kindred nature of mules seems to be mentally compared with the stubborn stupidity of camels and asses, where Brutus describes the state of servile drudgery to which he thinks that Coriolanus will reduce the people.

> "To his power he would have made them mules . . .
> Dispropertied their freedoms, holding them
> In human action and capacity,
> Of no more soul, nor fitness for the world
> Than *camels* for the war; who have their provand
> *Only for bearing burdens*, and sore blows
> For sinking under them." (*Cor.* ii. 1).

But "kine," continues the Natural History, have some affinity "with Buffles," and this draws attention to the ox as another of the dull plodders, strong but slow, with whom the world abounds. Thersites, who wound up his vituperation against Ajax by calling him "camel," in a later scene of the same Play pours out to the dregs his vials of contempt upon Agamemnon for his stupidity and subservience to his brother.

"An honest fellow enough . . . but he has not so much brain as ear wax . . . to what form, but that he is, should wit larded with malice, and malice farced with wit, turn him to? *To an ass were nothing: he is both ass and ox; to an ox were nothing, he is both ox and ass,*"† *&c.* He has previously told Ajax and Achilles that Ulysses and old Nestor "yoke you *like draught oxen*, and make you plough up the wars"‡—

* *Tr. Cr.* i. 2. † *Tr. Cr.* v. 1. ‡ *Ib.* ii. 1.

mere drudges; just as Petruchio pretends that he will treat Kate as goods and chattels—*my horse, my ox, my ass, my anything.*"*

"I begin to perceive," says Falstaff, "that I am made an *ass*" (alluding, perhaps, to the *thirst* noted by *Bacon*). "Ay, and an *ox too*," † retorts Ford. Here and in other places, *Bacon's* inquiries into the various properties of different kinds of meats are visible. The flesh of the ox is beef, and beef is a heating or "choleric" meat, and the eating of much beef tends rather to cloud the brain than to nourish it. But this is a digression.

Affinity is next observed between "hares and conies" (or rabbits). These are in another place classed as "timid creatures," with deer, also described as "melancholy creatures." The poet faithfully follows the careful, though brief notes of the observant naturalist, and makes hares, conies and deer the prototypes of timid or cowardly people.

"Depose me!" exclaims Falstaff when Prince Hal proposes to play the part of king. "If thou doest it . . . hang me up by the heels for a *rabbit-sucker or a poulter's hare.*"

Such creatures, on any alarm or slight noise, scuttle away to their forms and burrows. So the Servant in *Coriolanus*, describing to his comrades the coming of Caius Marius, declares that he has as many friends as enemies, who, now that they "see his crest up again . . . will out of their burrows like conies after rain." Little rabbits or conies may be seen sitting up at each end of the "New Birth" hieroglyphic headlines of which specimens were given in BACONIANA. . . . These "timid creatures" seem to have figured the Rosicrucian brethren who lived always as much as possible in retirement or secrecy, and who on the slightest warning of danger at once withdrew and hid themselves. In "Bacon's" curious collection of "Apopthegms," or witty sayings, is an anecdote which seems to contain a hint to the same effect. A scholar who had joined some friends for the purpose of catching conies, no sooner espied the creatures than he exclaimed, "Ecce Caniculi!" He was astonished to find by their sudden flight, that rabbits understood Latin.‡ Hares are more than timid, they are "coward hares," and repeatedly introduced as "fearful" and "flying," in contrast to lions and eagles, emblems of bold, brave, and soaring spirits.

* *Tam. Sh.* iii. 2. † *Mer. Wiv.* v. 5.

‡ See in Bacon's *Wks.* vii. 156, No. 218, and *Ib.* 186, 77, in the Apopthegms, which are not mere "witty sayings," but very ambiguous and full of hints.

There is, however, another idea attached to the rabbit as an emblem, namely, its *prolific* or productive power. *Bacon* (perhaps quoting from Aristotle) says:—"Some creatures bring forth many young ones at a burthen, as bitches, *hares*, *coneys*, &c. Some, ordinarily, but one; as women, lionesses, &c;" and again: "*Hares* and *rabbits* scarcely reach to seven years. Both creatures are very prolific."* These two ideas—of study, or the studious Brotherhood, retiring, and becoming "invisible" at the slightest noise or warning of danger—and of the productive nature of study—probably account for the frequent appearance of hares and rabbits in the hieroglyphic designs which adorn our Baconian books. But of these another time.

We have still to consider the "affinity between elephants and swine,"† of which *Bacon* says that "scarce any other species have affinity *with them;* yet *they* have some affinity." He does not point out the resemblances, as that both are vegetarians, both have snouts or proboscis, both are almost hairless, love to wallow in the mud, have small eyes, short tails, &c. Neither does he comment on the difference in size, manner of feeding, or any other of the many notable disparities between the elephant and the swine, but he dwells whenever either of these creatures is mentioned, upon its *slowness of progress.*

"As *slow* as the elephant." (*Tr. Cr.* i. 2).
"A hog in *sloth.*" (*Lear* iii. 4).

The swine will therefore be found everywhere to figure the bad extreme of slowness, "sloth"—the elephant, a ponderous, deliberate nind, slow in developing, but "long-lived," or whose works are of permanent value. Francis himself had learnt now to join to the strength of the elephant, his unhurried and deliberate progress. "The Lord St. Albans, who was not overhasty to raise theories, but *proceeded slowly* by experiments, was wont to say to some philosophers that would not go his pace, Gentlemen, Nature is a labyrinth, in which, *the very haste you move with,* will make you lose your way."

In "*Mr. Bacon's Discourse in Praise of his Sovereign*" (his Sovereign lady, Truth), he compares the preparation of the Queen when her realm was about to be invaded, to "*the*

* See *Nat. Hist.* 892, and *Hist. of Life and Death*, Sect. 15.

† See reference to *Swine* (play upon the name Bacon) and Elephant in "Edward Leigh" in this number.

travail of an elephant," the provisions whereof were infinite." When we come to a consideration of the Baconian emblems drawn from ancient mysticism, it will be seen that it is not so derogatory to the elephant as at first sight appears to couple him with the swine. C. M. P.

(To be continued.)

FRANCIS BACON'S BIRTHDAY.

AN article in the April number of BACONIANA, questions the accuracy of the date of Francis Bacon's birth, given in my paper on the "Biliteral Cipher Story," in BACONIANA for January. The date, 22nd January, 1560-1 is, however, certainly accurate.

The 22nd January, 1560-1 is the date given by Spedding. The same date is given in Montagu's "Life of Bacon." The 22nd January, 1561 (the historic date according to new style) is the date given in "Hepworth Dixon's Life," in the "Dictionary of National Biography," in the "Penny Cyclopædia," in the "English Cyclopædia," in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and, so far as I am aware, in every other authority.

The date of Francis Bacon's baptismal certificate, 25th January, 1560, printed at the end of the article referred to, being recorded under the old style, signifies that month of January which followed December, 1560, and was then computed as belonging to that year, though now reckoned the first month of the next year, 1561. This certificate therefore, proves with certainty that Francis Bacon was born in January, 1560-1. The short interval of three days between his birth and baptism was in accordance with the custom of the time. Queen Elizabeth was born on the 7th, and christened on the 10th September, 1533.

The celebration of Francis Bacon's 60th birthday took place, according to Spedding, on 22nd January, 1620-1. The tombstone inscription "(anno) ætatis, 66," would mean, in the 66th year of his age. There can, therefore, be no doubt that Francis Bacon was born on 22nd January, 1560-1.

As the effect of the change of style seems to have been imperfectly appreciated, some explanation of it may not be superfluous. I find, indeed, that the writer of the article elsewhere supposes that January, 1560, old style, preceded September, 1560, whereas it was, as already stated, the month

which *followed* December, 1560, and which is now reckoned historically as January, 1561.

In early Roman times the year began in March; the names of the months, September, October, November, and December, signifying the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th months, recall this usage; which agreed with the commencement of the solar year at the vernal equinox.

Julius Cæsar, in reforming the Calendar, adopted the 1st January as the commencement of the year. The usage continued, notwithstanding, to vary in different countries, at different periods; and sometimes Christmas, and sometimes even the variable festival of Easter was counted the beginning of the year.

Mr. Bond, Assistant Keeper of Public Records, in his "Handy Book for Verifying Dates" gives a full account of the usage in different countries at different dates. With respect to England and Ireland he states as follows:—

"In England and Ireland the year was reckoned,
From Christmas Day, until 1006.
From 1st January to 31st December—1067 to 1155.
From 25th March to 24th March—1155 to 1750.
From 25th March to 31st December—1751.
The day after 31st December, 1751, was called 1st January, 1752.
From 1st January to 31st December—1752, and at the present time."

In the course of the 16th century the 1st January was adopted as the commencement of the year in Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and some other countries.

In 1582 Pope Gregory XIII. corrected the Roman calendar by the omission of 10 days, and adopted the 1st January as the beginning of the year, which usage had prevailed in Rome and a great part of Italy since 1522. Florence retained the commencement at Lady Day until 1751. The Gregorian calendar was accepted by France, Spain and Portugal in 1582, and was introduced into Scotland in 1600.

In England, however, no change was made until 1752, when by statute 24, Geo. II. c. 23, the 1st January was substituted for the 25th March as the commencement of the year, and eleven days were omitted from the month of September in that year, to bring the calendar into harmony with the solar year. The omission of these days has no effect on the days of the month of previous years. The 22nd January, 1561, remains

the 22nd January for all time, but the months of January, February and March are now reckoned as the beginning, instead of the close of the year.

It is therefore a mistake to suppose that "in Elizabeth's time the historical year had long dated from the 1st January," and that "the ecclesiastical year, dating from 25th March, had nothing to do with the matter;" and also a mistake to suppose that the change of style could affect the days of the month in previous years.

In England and Ireland, in Elizabeth's reign, and down to 1752, the 25th March was for all purposes the legal commencement of the year. As an example, reference may be made to "Camden's Annals of Ireland," in which the years will be found to commence and close with Lady Day.

The result is that every document signed or recorded, and every event happening in Elizabeth's reign, in the months of January, February or March, was then reckoned as belonging to the preceding nine months, April to December; whereas it is now, since 1752, reckoned, for historical purposes, as belonging to the same year as the succeeding nine months. Thus a document dated January, 1560, is now called a document of January, 1560-1, or of January, A.D. 1561, if the historic date alone is given.

In my former paper, for simplicity, the historic dates only were given, instead of the double notation, all the dates being translated into new style. Thus, the document signed by Elizabeth on the day of Francis Bacon's birth is dated in fact 22nd January, 1560, though, as the record-keeper who produced it observed, "We now call this 1561." The other documents referred to as signed by Elizabeth, and De Quadra's letters, are dated January and February, 1560, and are therefore of 1560-1, or historically of the year A.D. 1561. The material point, for the present purpose, is that the events and documents referred to, however denoted, all belong to the same year, and give no ground for the doubts suggested in the April article.

Turning now to a somewhat later date, the short statements made in my paper as to Dudley's relations with Lady Sheffield, and subsequently with Lady Essex, were drawn, I believe correctly, from "a study of the facts in the books of Mr. Craick, Mr. Devereux, and Miss Strickland," which the article recommends. These facts, like other authentic history, appear to me absolutely incompatible with the hypothesis of a marriage between Elizabeth and Leicester, an hypothesis unsupported by a tittle of evidence of fact.

"The truth or untruth of the cipher story" is not, as suggested in the article, "another matter," but was the very matter in hand.

The story of Francis Bacon's parentage is, I believe, distinctly proved to be fabulous, both by Francis Bacon's authentic declarations, and by ascertained facts of history. The claim that Francis Bacon wrote the "Faery Queen" is likewise shewn by the facts I stated in April to be also as certainly a fable; Mr. Woodward's conjectures and surmises to the contrary notwithstanding.

Francis Bacon's motive in enjoining on his executors the publication of the "Felicities of Elizabeth" after his death seems plain enough. During Elizabeth's lifetime her enemies, who hired assassins to poison her, also invented and industriously propagated slanders against her birth and character, hoping to detach the allegiance of her subjects. Their plots failed, their lies were not believed, but "everywhere cried down;" and Elizabeth retained the loyal affection of her people. But, lest the smouldering ashes of falsehood should again be blown into flame, Bacon bequeathed this record, which he desired to be "*permanent in future ages*," as his dying witness to the character of a great Queen; not, surely, as the cipher story would make it, as a legacy of imposture?

Fox's history of "The Imprisonment of the Princess Elizabeth," confirmed by other contemporary writers, describes the rigour of that imprisonment; which, even when at length the princess was allowed to leave her chamber for exercise in the prison garden, required that the gates should be shut, the keepers in attendance, and forbad other prisoners even to look out of their windows. Rigour which proves that the "vulgar intimacy," which is now suggested, was as impossible, as the insinuation is baseless!

It is vain to suggest that other decipherers should be employed to test the "cipher story." Mrs. Gallup when challenged failed to point out the cipher, an easy matter if it really existed; and now avows that without extraordinary faculties and a kind of "*inspiration*" none, save herself, need expect to perceive it. Yet our simplicity is to take on trust this invisible puzzle, and is asked to believe, that to the remote chance of its discovery the wisdom of Francis Bacon determined to commit his final effort, to enlighten posterity, and at the same time to convict the witness of his life of falsehood.

Are we to believe Francis Bacon himself, or the cipher

story imputed to him? On which side lies the weight of evidence? Be it remembered that the great Protestant writers of the Elizabethan age agree with Bacon's witness to Elizabeth's character, as a great Queen, and a woman, whatever her faults and foibles, yet of unstained virtue.* Roger Ascham, Bishop Aylwin, Fox, Lord Burleigh, Sir Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and the nation's loyalty attest it. Against this is to be weighed the malignant gossip of nameless enemies, "venomous vipers" Fox calls them, which even De Quadra and De la Mothe, in retailing it to the Spanish and French Courts, declared they did not believe, and the "Cipher Story." G. C. BOMPAS.

GERMAN LINKS IN THE CHAIN.

JOHANN GOTLIEB BUHLE has some interesting remarks on Francis St. Alban, in his "über den ursprung der Rosenkreutzers und Freimauer." (1806).

He says indisputably Baco von Verulam had the intention of founding a Society of Scholars, which, by observation and research, would further the Science of Physics. His whole literary effort, all his works point to it, as well as to the removal of the Scholastic Aristotelian Philosophy, and the Theosophic, cabalistic, alchemical illusions of his contemporaries; and to the desire to rouse them to a surer, more fruitful study of Nature. This Nature-study, as he rightly judged, could be best and most easily carried on if the most learned of the nation bound themselves together for the work, and the country openly assisted them in their labours. He put this forward in an allegory after the manner of his time, and in his "New Atlantis" figured an island, Ben Salem, on which for a thousand years such a society had existed, under the title of "Solomon's House:" for the Law-giver of the inhabitants of this island owed his wisdom to Solomon. The object or aim of this society was the spread of Natural Philosophy, which was called a "College of the Works of the Six Days." Every twenty years the members of the society were sent to foreign lands, in two ships, not to hold intercourse or to trade with them, but to gain more "Light of Nature" by enquiry. The ritual and dress of the members of "Solomon's House" were carefully given by Baco.

A. A. L.

* ED. NOTE.—Miss Strickland gives a very different view of Elizabeth. Her facts" and "authentic history' do not further this theory.

THE POEMS ASCRIBED TO SPENSER.

(*Concluded from page* 228).

VI.—The Disappointment Theory.

MR. BOMPAS will have it that Spenser was a disappointed and badly treated man. For a son of the journeyman tailor his rise was most rapid ; and (apart from the poems) there is every indication that Spenser, the Irish official, was behaving very naturally, was sticking to business and prospering pecuniarily. If the Irish official were not the real author of the poems, the inconsistency entirely disappears.

The "Tears of the Muses" appeared in 1591. To quote from it :—

"Melpomene" laments the low state of the stage.

Thalia, (like "Webbe," "Puttenham," and "Sidney," in the essays on English poetry) laments the abject condition of literature in England.

"Terpsichore" records :—

> "Whoso hath in the lap of soft delight
> Been long time lulled, &c., &c.,
> If chance him fall into calamitie,
> Finds greater burden of his miserie."

When was the Irish official lulled long time in the lap of delight, and what calamitie did he fall into ?

Urania objects to ignorance.

> "But hell and darkness and the grisly grave.
> Is ignorance the enemy of grace."

"Mother Hubbard's Tale" is stated by the dedication "to have been long sithens composed in the raw conceit of my youth." The poet objects to difference of texts.

> "From whence arrive diversities of sects,
> And hateful heresies of God abhor'd."

The "Ruines of Time" contains a long lament of Verlame city. Verulam, the site of St. Albans, where Francis, as a boy, was brought up. What concern had the son of the London tailor (who came, says Dr. Grosart, out of Lancashire) with St. Albans ?

"Spenser's genius," says the Rev. D. Hubbard, "was aristocratic in its preferences." So was Bacon's and so was "Shakespeare's."

Says Mr. Palgrave, "the stanzas on Leicester's death show *strong and unmistakable feeling.*"

In the "Daphnaida," in 1591, the poet writes:—

> "So as I mused on the miserie
> In which men live and I of many most,
> Most miserable man."

And in the "Faerie Queen," of 1590, probably written several years before:

> "Who so in pomp of proud estate (quoth she)
> Does swim and bathes himself in courtly bliss,
> Does waste his days in dark obscuritie,
> And in oblivion ever buried is."

Mr. Bompas says, Spenser in his poems, bitterly deplored his banishment. This verse looks as though he had no desire to be at the English Court.

In "Mother Hubbard's Tale," published about 1591, but written, says Dr. Grosart, several years earlier, is the following:—

> "So pitiful a thing is suitors' state,
> Most miserable man whom wicked fate
> Hath brought to Court to sue for had ywist.
> . . . . . .
> What hell it is in suing long to bide
> To lose good days that might be better spent,
> To waste long nights in pensive discontent,
> To speed to-day, to be put back to-morrow
> To feed on hope with fear of sorrow.
> To have thy Prince's grace yet want his Peeres
> To have thy asking *yet wait manie years*
> Unhappy wight borne to disastrous end
> That doth his life in so long tendance bend."

And also,—

> "Therefore if fortune thee in Court to live,
> In case thou ever there wilt hope to thrive
> To some of these thou must thyself apply
> Else as a thistle-down in th' air doth fly,
> So vainly shalt thou too and fro be cast."

Will someone please explain as applied to Spenser the line—

> "To have thy asking yet wait manie years."

The indications above given us do however happen to be in accordance with what we know of the facts of Francis Bacon's life, the delays in his advancement and his bitter disappointment, as well as with the Cipher Story.

VII.—REFERENCES TO MYTHICAL AND HISTORICAL PERSONAGES AFTERWARDS DEALT WITH IN PLAYS, POEMS, OR ESSAYS.

The following are named in Spenser's works :—

Locrine.	Cæsar.
King Lear and his three daughters.	Edward II.
Cymbeline (Kimbeline).	Henry VII.
Venus and Adonis.	Richard III.
Anthony and Cleopatra.	

Baconians who have wondered how the unmelodious Shaxpere or Shagspur was converted into "Shakespeare," should read their Spenser, who judging from the invented names of persons in the "Faerie Queen," was particularly good at this sort of thing.

Book II., Canto xiii.

"Yet gold all is not that doth golden seem
Ne all good knights that *shake* well *speare* and shield."

Book III., Canto i.

"And shivering speare in bloody field first shook."

Also,

"And in his clownish hand a sharp bore speare he shook."

Book IV., Canto ii.

"With that they gan their shivering speares to shake."

And

"He all enraged his shivering speare did shake."

The germ of the idea of shake-speare is to be found as far back as 1579, where the poet in the Glosse to the "Shepheard's Calendar" for October refers to Pallas. See the sentence: "which the lady disdaining *shaked* her *speare* at him."

VIII.—THE ALLUSIONS TO KILCOLMAN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD.

These appear in "Colin Clout," in some parts of the "Fairie Queen," and the posthumous cantos of mutability. Was "the poet" writing about a neighbourhood he knew?

We know from the Harvey letters that in dealing with the marriage of the Thames (see "Faerie Queen," Book IV., Canto xi.) Immerito says, he worked from Holingshed. We know also how beautifully in the "Ruines of Rome" he pictured that city although there is no suggestion of Spenser ever having been in Italy, and there is great doubt whether Francis had been there. Take again the description of the principal Irish rivers in the canto I have just referred to. There is no possibility that "the poet" was writing from personal or local inspection. Was the poet's "local colour" about Kilcolman first hand or worked up from a map? Says Dr. Grosart, "To-day the fields and hills are commonplace and unpicturesque." The "Mulla" is five miles distant! Its correct name is Awbeg. There is no mountain of Mole but some hills called Ballyhowra about five miles in another direction.

The "Allo" appears to be a poetical and not an Irish name for the river Blackwater, whose source is the hills of Slievelogher. "Arlo Hill," according to Dean Church, is the poet's name, for Harlow, mentioned several times in the Irish State papers, as a fastness in the Galtee mountains, frequented by disaffected Irish and the scene of many encounters. The "local colour" therefore, of which so much is made by the Spenser biographers, could well have been written by a person in England with the aid of a small map and a poetic imagination, which a large map would have doubtless somewhat subdued.

IX.—The poet was a lawyer.

I have already quoted Harvey's statement that Immerito was a lawyer, but before giving quotations from poems let me anticipate the usual objection. Shakspur, according to the very latest theory, learnt his law through his father's difficulties and debts, and the accompanying legal proceedings. So I shall be told that Spenser learnt *his* law in his offices of Clerk of Degrees in Dublin and Clerk to the Munster Council. My answer is, that if these appointments necessitated knowledge of law, a trained lawyer and not a mere copying clerk would have been appointed. But knowledge of law was not required in the appointments he filled. The following are a few out of many quotations available, and I think lawyers will agree they give indications of extensive knowledge of both civil and criminal law pleading and conveyancing:—

"As she bequeathed in her last testament
. . . Who dying whylom did divide this fort
To them in equal shares, in equal fee."
—"Fairie Queen," Book I., Canto ii.

"Now were they liege men to this Lady free,
And her knights service ought to hold of her in fee."
—Book III., Canto i.

"The charge of Justice given was in trust,
That they might *execute her judgments* wise,
. . . Which proudly did *impugn* her *sentence* just.
Whereof no braver *precedent* this day."
—Book V., Canto iv.

"So is my Lord now *seised* of all the land,
As in his fee with *peaceable estate*,
And *quietly* doth hold it in his hand."
—Book VI., Canto iv.

"Therefore a *Jury* was *impaneld streight*,
T' *enquire* of them. . . . . ."

"Of all their crimes she then *indicted* was."

. . . . . .

"The *warrant* straight was made, and therewithal
A *Bailiff* errant forth. . . . . "

"The damsel was *attacht*, and shortly brought
Unto the *bar*, whereat she was *arraigned;*
But she *thereto* no would *plead nor answer aught*,
Even for stubborn pride which her *restrained*,
So judgment past as is by law ordained
In cases like; which, when at last she saw,

. . . . . .

Cried Mercy to *abate* the *extremity* of the law."
—Book VI., Canto vii.

"Are changed of Time, which doth them all *disseise*."
—Book VII., Canto vii.

"The right between *party and party*."

"Will *compound* between the murderer and the friend of the *party murdered* which *prosecute the action*."

"How can they do so justly? Doth not the *act of the parent* in any *lawful grant* or *conveyance bind his heirs?*"

"It is a *capital crime* to *devise or purpose the death* of the King, the reason is," &c.

"As well in all *pleas of the Crown*, as also for all *enquiries* for *escheat lands attainted, wardships.*"

"By the common law the *accessory cannot be proceeded against* till the principal has received his trial."

"Close and colorable conveyances."
—Veue of Ireland.

X.—The Veue of Ireland.

Those familiar with Bacon's acknowledged writings should carefully read this prose composition. It indicates a marvellous general knowledge of literature and history, and shows that the writer had been specially reading up the facts about Ireland before writing the treatise. Camden and Buchanan appear to have been two of the principal authorities consulted. Except for the mention of the O'Brien incident at the gallows there is no indication that the writer is dealing with facts necessarily within his own personal observation. This incident may have been mentioned in this way merely as part of the scheme of concealment of the real identity of the writer. It must be remembered that although in MS. in 1596 it was not printed until 1633, and that one of the manuscripts (the most correct one, says Dr. Grosart) turns up very suspiciously amongst the Lambeth MS., where so much Baconian correspondence is to be found. The Veue reads to me like the quiet attempt of a statesman not in power to instruct the minds and influence the conduct of those who had the actual control of Irish affairs. See the suggestions at page 252 of Grosart, Vol. IX., as to the appointment of a Lord Deputy and a Lord Lieutenant, and indicating for the latter office the Earl of Essex, "upon whom the eye of all England is fixed and *our last hopes now rest.*" It seems a piece of impudence for a clerk to a provincial Irish Council to take upon himself to advise Ministers of State as to the best treatment of Irish difficulties seeing the many superior Irish officials available, and there is no evidence of his being asked to do so. Francis, however, was always tendering his advice on State affairs, and the suggestions in this case as to the appointment of Essex were adopted.

XI.—The Poet was a Humourist.

He was not to be trusted "to pass by a jest."
"And Debons shayre was that is Devonshyre."
—F. J., Book II., Canto x.

"Yet was it said there should to him a sonne
Be gotten, not begotten, which should drink."
—Book VI., Canto iv.

"Yet they were bred of Somers—heat they say."
—"Prothalamion" on Marriage of the
Ladies Somerset, Stanza 4.

"And endless happiness of thine own name."
—(Earl of Essex, Dev-ereux=hereux),
Stanza 9.

XII.—Parallelisms.

I would like to deal with these at some length, but space will not allow. I must content myself with a few by way of encouragement to others to look for more. They will be found so plentiful as to invoke the inevitable Shakespearian retort that Spenser was largely drawn upon by the immortal bard, who made a practice of borrowing the ideas and expressions of other writers!

Spenser.—"To be wise and eke to love
Is granted scarce to God above."

Bacon.—"That it is impossible to love and to be wise."

Shakespeare.—"Or else you love not; for to be wise and love
Exceeds man's might; that dwells with God above."

Spenser.—"In deep discovery of the mind's disease
. . . Then with some cordials seek first to appease
The inward languor of my wounded heart."

Shakespeare.—"Cans't thou minister to a mind diseased?"

Spenser.—"Of this world's theatre in which we stay
My love, like the spectator, idly sits."

Shakespeare.—"As in a theatre the eyes of men,
After some well graced actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him who enters next."

Spenser.—"The fall of Lucifer as the result of ambition is described in 'Hymn of Heavenly Love.'"

Shakespeare.—"And when he falls he falls like Lucifer."
—"Wolsey's Farewell," *Henry VIII.*

Spenser.— "The evil done
Dyes not when breath the body first doth leave,
But from the grandsire to the nephew's son,
And all his seed, the curse doth often cleave."

Shakespeare.—"The evil that men do lives after them."

Spenser.—In Book II., Canto ix., we have the reference to the porter at the gate, and his 'larum bell. Later on we have the term "hurly burly."

Shakespeare.—Compare *Macbeth.*

Spenser.—"When gentle sleep his heavy eyes would close
. . . Upon his heavy eylids."

Shakespeare.—"Sleep, gentle sleep, why hast thou slighted me,
That thou no more my heavy eyelids close?"

Spenser.—"And steal away the crown of their good name."

Shakespeare.—"But he who filches from me my good name."

Spenser.—"Thou hast with borrowed plumes thyself endewed."

Shakespeare.—"His feathers are but borrowed."
"Sits mocking in our plumes."

Spenser.—"To pity him that list to play the fool."

Shakespeare.—"It takes a wise man to play the fool."

Spenser.—"In seas of trouble and of toilsome pain."

Shakespeare.—"Or to take arms against a sea of troubles."

Spenser.—"That even those which did backbite him are choked with their own venom and break their galls to hear his honourable report."

Shakespeare.— "By the Gods
Ye shall digest the venom of your spleen
Though it do split you."

Spenser.—"On whose mighty shoulders most dost rest
The burden of this kingdom's government."

Shakespeare.—"And from these shoulders, these ruined pillars,

Out of pity taken a load would sink a navy
. . . Oh ! 'tis a burden."

Spenser.—"The goats stumbling is here noted as an evil sign. The like to be marked in all histories and that not the least of the Lord Hastings in King Richard the third his days. For . . . it is said that in the morning riding towards the Tower of London, there to sit upon matters on counsel his horse stumbled twice or thrice on the way."

The biographers have been worrying as to who was "E. K." from whose Glosse in the "Shepheard's Calendar" for May I take the above passage. Well, it was W.S ! For when I referred to the Play of *Richard III.* I found he with his economical tendencies had again turned the above incident to account.

Hastings.—"Three times to-day my foot-cloth horse did stumble,
And started when he looked upon the Tower
As loth to bear me to the slaughter-house."

In conclusion, I must confess to being still unrepentant for my article in the January BACONIANA, and trust that the Spenser question may be carefully considered by others. Some one should inspect the "Spenser" portrait with golden red hair which, as the Queen set the fashion, was doubtless, the popular colour. She left it to Lady Carey. To quote the dedication to "Muiopotmos;" was it for name or "kindred's sake" (she was a daughter of Sir John Spencer), or "for that honourable name which ye have, by your *brave deeds, purchased to yourself*" (viz., that she had been permitted to marry into the Queen's family).

In view of the Cipher Story and in faith of the absolute truthfulness of Mrs Gallup, I incline to the opinion that the picture was a family portrait which the Queen at her death wished to be kept in the possession of her nearest acknowledged relative.

PARKER WOODWARD.

NOTES ON THE "RELIGION AND LEARNING," OF EDWARD LEIGH.

EDWARD LEIGH was a Leicestershire man, born, Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienses* tells us, 24th March, 1602, "being the day and year on which Queen Elizabeth deceased." He became a Commoner of Magdalen Hall, *an.* 1616, and proceeded in Arts in 1623, went to the Middle Temple and studied law, wherein he made considerable progress, yet, before he had been there two years, he, with others were forced thence by the great Plague that violently raged in London 1625. After a visit to France he returned to the study of Law, Divinity, and History, in each of which in his elder years he attained to some eminence. Afterwards he retired to Banbury in Oxfordshire. Later, during the civil troubles he was appointed to the House of Commons to sit in the Assembly of Divines, "Where he behaved himself as learnedly as most of the Divines then sitting." He was also a Colonel of a Regiment for the Parliament, and was among those Presbyterian members turned out of the House of Commons by the Army, in 1648, and imprisoned in the public Inn called the King's Head, in the Strand. From which time till towards the King's Restoration when he and others were restored by General Monk to their places in Parliament he "wrote Books." Among these were the *Treatise of Religion and Learning in six Books* (1656 *Fol.*). And *Choice Observations on all the Kings of England from the Saxons to the death of King Charles I.* (1661 Oct.). To the former of these the elder Disraeli alludes in his "Curiosities of Literature," pointing out how Leigh in his "Postcript to the reader, bitterly complains of the many mistakes made in the printing of his work. Errata there is certainly much, about a page and a-half. Leigh says "False interpunctions there are too many." "The ittalyc character, not observed," "words parted where they should be joined," "words misplaced," "chronological mistakes," "a syllable too much," "a letter too much." All of which go to prove that as late as 1656 either authors did not correct their books for press, and the errors of printers were hideously frequent, or else that the errors were introduced by *malice prepense.* The question naturally follows—by whom?

Leigh gives us a list of Renowned Scholars under the title of "Learning," with a list of the colleges in the Universities which bred them. Under the letter B we find Roger Bacon

with no date appended. He is described as a great mathematician. Sir Francis Bacon, Leigh says, "is called by one, the Aristotle of our Nation. He calls philosophy somewhere his darling, as I remember. His learned writings show his great parts. Peirskius* often lamented that he went not to him when he was in Paris." That is all. No mention is made of Trinity, Cambridge, having been his college, although it is twice mentioned: once as being founded in 1353, and in another place as being founded in 1584. Bateman, and Stephen Gardiner are alone spoken of as having graduated there. Scholars renowned for Poetry are—Gower, Chaucer, Spencer, Daniel, Draiton, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Ben Jonson. In the margin are added in pen and ink the names of Cowley, Milton, Cleveland, and Randolph. In a separate list of Poets are Sir Philip Sydney, Francis Bacon, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Edmund Spencer—"Prince of poets" of his time. "Poets of old" are Chaucer, Spenser, Ockland, "Poets of late" Alabaster, Serjeant, Hoskins, and Herbert. Philosophers, Sir Francis Bacon and Gilbert. Learned Antiquaries, Leland, Camden, Spelman, Seldon. Learned women, Queen Elizabeth, the Lady Jane Grey, and Weston. In the address to the reader he says, "William Alabaster, an excellent poet, he wrote a poem called 'Elisæis,' of the chief things of Queen Elizabeth's reign, but it was not perfected." Buchanen is mentioned as an excellent poet, as was his pupil, James I., but among the Historians Buchanen is ignored. Leigh is a strange Lexicographer, for the great Playwright William Shakespeare finds no mention, though, as we have seen, Beaumont and Fletcher are not despised, nor Ben Jonson. In his Fifth Chapter on Civil and Canon Law, he quotes from Saint Alban's *Advancement of Learning*, on the Drama.

"Dramaticall or Representative poetry is, as it were, a veritable History; it sets out the image of things, as if they were present, History as if they were past." He says elsewhere that, "Poetry principally serves for venting extraordinary affections," and again, describing poetry, he calls it, "the quintessence," or rather, the "luxury of Learning." Of painting he says, "It is silent poetry, and poetry a speaking picture," by which we see he is no inapt pupil of Francis Saint Alban, whom he chooses to rank as a poet rather than the player Shaxper. In speaking of Magdalen College he notices that Prince Henry was a scholar there, also Mr.

* Gassendi, de vita Peireskius, i. 6.

Burton, who "wrote of Melancholy, upon whose tomb there is this witty epitaph :—"*Pauc is notus paucioribus ignotus Hic jacet Democritus Junior cui vitam panter et mortem Dedit Melancholia,*" of the witty interpretation of which I leave my readers to make what they can.

The printer has been busy disjoining, and misplacing letters. Are the errors here made with a purpose ? One almost becomes certain that there is more here than meets the eye, especially as the first line is underscored by a pen, and a marginal hand, exquisitely sketched in ink, points to the *Pauc is*—of the first line. Leigh ingeniously says in his Postscript, "we have not Plantine nor Stevens here."

A full list of famous printers are given on page 54. Aldus Manutius, Paulus his son. Venice. In France, Crispinus, Henry Stevens, the father to Charles, and Charles the father to Robert, Robert to Henry, and Henry to Paul, all printers. Christopher Plantine of Antwerp, a most famous and learned printer. Leigh has studied Printers and their "curious" art.

Before leaving the subject of Burton and his epitaph let us turn to Anthony Wood's *Athenæ Oxoniensis* and see what he says of it. He states: "The inscription was made by Robert, and put up by the care of his brother, William Burton." The last line here runs differently to Leigh's. Wood has it: "*Cui vitam dedit et mortem Melancholia.*" Perhaps the printer was less "famous" than the one who printed Leigh's quotation. Though Shakespeare is omitted from every list of poets our author tells us: "Poets were the first Priests, Prophets, Legislators, Politicians, and the first Philosophers, Astronomers, Historographers, Oroters, and Musicians in the world." Music, he adds, was invented by Pythagoras from the Smiths' hammers. There is indeed nothing, as our Francis says, new under the sun. Handel was but a plagiarist after all,—Pythagoras was before him with his harmonious Blacksmith, and Wagner's Mime limps after !

Among his other books there is a little octavo volume called "England Described" (mostly taken, Anthony Wood says, from Camden).

Turning to Stratford-on-Avon one is met by the following: "A little Mercat town ; there is a stone bridge supported with fourteen arches." Nothing more. At Gosford Gate, "There hangeth to be seen a great shield—bone of a Wild Bore which Guy, Earl of Warwick, slew in hunting, when he had turned up with his sword a great pit, or pond, which is now called Swan Fuell, but Swine's Well in times

past. There is a note to say, "the bone is rather of an elephant, being not so little as a yard in length."

Here, at least, a *Swine* and a *Swan* seem to be synonymous. Is it only a curious coincidence that Francis himself says: "Among beasts the Elephant and the Swine are alike?" It will be well to note this in our book of memory. If Marlowe be one of Bacon's pseudonyms as suggested, the reason for his choosing the name may be found in Leigh, who says: "Chalk commonly called Marle, which, being spread upon corn-ground, eaten out of heart by long tillage, doth quicken the same again, so as that after one year's rest it never lieth fallow but yieldeth again to the husbandman his seed in plentiful measures."

Britain is prettily named "The grassy Isle so-called." We are sure to turn up odd little bits of interesting information when perusing old writers like Leigh. Here is one strangely german to the matter. It appears under the title of Cheshire. This county is described as having cheeses made there in great quantity, and as producing the best dairy women. The river Dee "passeth by Banchor,* a famous monastry." We are then told Hugh Wolf was made Earl of Chester by William I. Then comes an astonishing statement, that Edgar, King of England, triumphed over *Macon, King of Mann*, and of the Islands, who, with all the Princes of Wales was brought to do homage to him. Note the close connection of Macon with Princes of Wales, and with Cheshire. The Earl of Chester is one of the titles of our Prince of Wales to this day.

It has been already suggested that Bacon lay some time after 1626, *perdu* in the Island of Mann—also that he himself was an unacknowledged Prince of Wales—known in certain quarters as *Macon*, the B and M being in ancient tongues interchangeable letters. Are there not here some startling pinholes through which we may see great objects—darkly as yet—but in time, soon perhaps, face to face?

Leigh describes Edgar the King, sitting in a Barge at the fore-deck, "Kennadie, King of the Scots; Malcolm, King of Cumberland; Macon, King of Mann, at the oar round him, along the river Dee, in a triumphant show to his great glory, and joy of his beholders." It seems that a Leigh was King of Cheshire in old times. It was a great family and its descendant tells us "one Magnanimous Leigh was in Richard

* *Bancornaberg*, a pre-Saxon University of Christian philosophers, where "Catwg, the Zoroaster, and Ancourin and Taliessen the Homer and Pindar of British poets" studied.

II.'s reign." Other pieces of information given "to set forth the glory of the nation" are that King Henry VII. made Cheshire a County, and that the Duke of Cornwall, King Edward III.'s son, was invested by a wreath on his head, and a ring on his finger."

It has been suggested by one literary man that the reason for Shakespeare's name being omitted from Leigh's book is that playwrights in those days were not thought worthy of notice. Leigh speaks of "an Elegy on the deplored death of that rare Column of Parnassus, Mr. John Cleveland who wrote plays." Leigh thought Shakespeare no rare Column of Parnassus Why? That he was neither contemptuous of the Drama as a means of Education, nor of playwrights as Poets has been proved. What theory fits the question better than that he knew as others did the truth—and was silent?

One fact more. Francis St Alban left in his will a sum of money to the poor of Hempstead, where he says, during the plague he heard good sermons. We find in Edward Leigh, "Hamsted, a little Merkat Town, called Hehan Hamstead,* situated among the hills by a Riveret side." Is the printer again at fault, and is Hemel Hemsted meant? and which *is* the happy Hampstead that found favour in our Francis St. Alban's eyes? Echo answers: which?

ALICIA A. LEITH.

FRANCIS "BACON'S" STYLE.

[The following paper was, for the most part, published in BACONIANA (1st series), May 1892. That number is now out of print, and meanwhile, the result of recent researches have strengthened old doubts as to the true authors of much of the literature of the 16th and 17th centuries. Since the same inquiries continue to be repeated which caused the penning of this paper, it is thought desirable to reprint it, with a few additional remarks suggested by increased experience, and a wider range of observation.]

HOW do you describe or discriminate the style of Bacon? Is it possible to distinguish his writings from those of any author of his time by means of their style alone? And what is his style?

These and similar questions are not infrequently asked, and they certainly ought to be answered, for it is becoming more and more certain that we are soon to claim for Bacon the authorship of many works "put forth," "produced,"

* Domesday Book mentions a Manor of Henamsted (Hempsted) in the hundred of Albaneston, near the Church of St. Alban.

"published" and "fathered" under other names than his. Yet no distinct, satisfactory answer has come to such inquiries.

Bacon's style has been described as "clear," "precise." "pithy," "terse," "ponderous," learned," "dry," "rich," "imaginative," "poetic," "noble." I could pile up these epithets until you were weary of reading them, and could make each contradict another, but of what use would all this be? No finer criticism of his style or manner of writing could be penned than that of Macaulay, and many other authors have given their various opinions on the same subject. But all said, and all read, do any of these criticisms help us to identify the style of our great master, so that, meeting with a piece of his work, we are able, without hesitation, to declare: "This is Bacon's—we know it by his style?"

And what can be more different in that which we have learned to call *style*—the characteristic manner of expression and diction—than many of the works, or fragments of works, which we know to be Bacon's? Macaulay was fully alive to this great disparity even among the Essays, and he attributes it to differences of age in the author. Always old in judgment and understanding, the *young* man is more peremptory, dogmatic, and consequently prosaic, than the same man mellowed by age, with the accumulated stores of knowledge to sweeten his imagination, and to furnish him with similes, metaphors and axioms drawn from the centre of the sciences.

We see in the Essays, and, indeed, in the various editions of all his other works, increasing richness in diction, greater depth of feeling, more poetic expression, as years roll by, and as wisdom and the continued working within the author of noble and "heroic" thoughts do their spiriting gently.

Yet after all, to judge of the experience of others by our own, we do not feel greatly enlightened as to the particular point in question by any commentaries, hand books or criticisms which have been written about Bacon and his style. Quite apart from the discrepancies discussed by Macaulay, upon what general principles does any one propose to harmonize the "styles" of those very Essays with the *Novum Organum?* or of the *New Atlantis* with the *Order of the Helmet*, or *The Conference of Pleasure?* or these again with the *Tracts of the Law*, or with the beautiful verses, *Life's a Bubble*, or yet again *The Praise of the Queen* with the too-much despised *Translations of Certain Psalms, The History of Winds* or of *Salt, Sulphur and Mercury?*

The only general ground upon which these and many other unlike styles in Bacon's works are to be accounted for, is that pointed out by Bacon himself, when he declared that the *matter* of any piece of writing should determine the style; in short, that a man should use whatsoever style or manner of speech may best suit the subject to be treated of.

No doubt we should all like to be able to do as Bacon airily suggests, and write upon every subject with equal facility, and in the manner most agreeable to our theme; but who is it that says: "*Le style c'est l'homme*"? Words are *images of thoughts;* and we poor commonplace writers can only write on the few subjects of which we understand something, and with a style limited by our little knowledge and great commonplacedness.

Bacon was hampered by none of our clogs and drawbacks. He had, we know, nothing ready to his hand in the way of dictionaries, books of reference, or *Thesaurus* of words and phrases, and our language before his time was very poor; but what was that to him, who had a dictionary and "a mint of phrases in his brain," and who made, as he said, a grammar for himself? His thoughts were very clear-cut, very brilliant, and the words flew to meet them. You will see for yourselves, when you look into the matter, how these things were. But up to this point we seem to be as far as ever from reaching our aim—namely, to be able, by sure and indubitable signs, to distinguish the style of Bacon, so that we need scarcely ever hesitate (excepting, perhaps, in a business document or formal letter) to put a finger on a given page and declare that this is or is not Bacon's writing.

Then are we to give it up as hopeless? Surely not. Since we cannot come to any satisfactory conclusion by arguing only upon what Bacon calls "generals," let us leave these and come to particulars.

The smallest particulars which we have to consider in the present case are the *words*, the vehicle of thought; therefore let us look a little into Bacon's vocabulary. Here we are met by a great difficulty. For Bacon found our language poor and empty, deficient in every kind of ornament, totally inadequate to the exposition of his lofty and complete theories, his vigorous arguments and reasoning, his subtle and imaginative ideas. He left this English of ours rich, full, and furnished at all points, a noble model of language, such as he desired to construct by selecting materials from the best of other nations.

What, then, was old, what new? Which words did Bacon import from abroad? Which did he adapt from the Latin and other tongues? Which did he coin in his private mint?

These are far-reaching questions, and they can only be absolutely settled after we have ascertained how many of the works at present ascribed to various authors are truly Bacon's. *It was he who filled up all numbers and did that to which the works of Greece and Rome cannot compare.* Ben Jonson says so, and we are therefore prepared to find a multitude of unrecognized works. Meanwhile there is an excellent concordance to *Shakespeare*, and thereby we may to a great extent gather in what particulars and to what extent the philosopher and the poet differ in their vocabulary.

More than once I have been told by eminent philologists that the difference in "style" between the works of Bacon and *Shakespeare* is so tremendous as to prohibit the possibility of their being produced by the same author. I have asked: Does this observation apply to the vocabulary? and the reply has been: "Yes, assuredly; the vocabulary plays a very important part in the style of any writer." Then I have said: You consider that the vocabulary, the actual *words* used by Bacon, are so manifestly different from those used by *Shakespeare* as necessarily to affect the whole style? Again the answer is: "Yes, certainly." And this, I believe, has been a very common or popular notion.

Now, this is what is found to be the case in upwards of one hundred and thirty chapters, letters, fragments and portions of various works examined word by word, and compared with the *Shakespeare* concordance.

Exclude from the question proper names and absolute technicalities of science and words of learning, such as apogees and perigees, sublimate of mercury, pneumatics, convex lenses, logarithms, acroamatic, or exoteric, or magistral logic, terms which no one would expect to meet with in the *Shakespeare* plays, and on the other hand, discarde vulgarisms, oaths and colloquialisms, such as could not find place in scientific writing, or even in letters. The result, then, is that, taking from many pieces, of every two hundred words from the acknowledged works of Bacon there are three words *not* in *Shakespeare;* in *Shakespeare* there are fewer still which are not in Bacon.

Here we must insert a saving clause. It does not follow that the same part of a verb, the same form of an adjective or

adverb, or even of some few nouns, may be precisely the same; but they are near enough to be regarded as close relations, husband and wife, or at least first cousins.

For instance, we find in the poetry *advantageable*, in the prose *dis-advantageable*, each once only. In the one *confinable, uncomprehensive, inexecrable, answerable;* in the other *unconfinable, comprehensive, execrable, unanswerable.* In the poetry *plantage*, in the prose *boscage;* both from the French, and neither repeated; and so with many other words, which, when rare or very exceptionable and peculiar, seem to be the very coinage of Bacon's brain, and, when met with in unexpected places, are like the pebbles in the fairy tale, to act as hints or guides to the discovery of his works.

Analysis of his enormous vocabulary is beyond the scope of this paper; we trust that nothing will be taken for granted, but that readers will test this matter of "words, words, mere words." There are, however, other points more slippery of observation, which, once mastered, seem to afford a still more serviceable touchstone. We allude to the *habitual* words, pet phrases and turns of speech, of which hardly a page or passage in Bacon's writings is entirely barren. To begin with a few nouns:—

Advantage.	Inquiry.	Observation.
Aim.	Instance.	Occasion.
Art.	Kind.	Order.
Cause.	Knowledge (some-	Proportion.
Character.	times plural).	Purpose.
Colour.	Law.	Question.
Conclusion.	Man, "*A man* who,"	Reason.
Contrary.	etc.	Sort.
Defect, or Deficiency.	Matter.	Sum.
Effect.	Method.	Thing.
End.	Nature.	Time.
Form.	Note.	Truth.
Image.	Nothing.	

We see at once that these words are all intimately connected with Bacon's philosophical system, and with things uppermost in his mind. Every new sight or phenomenon, every fresh scrap of information or discovery of error, or popular delusion, set him thinking with Polonius:—

"Now remains
That we find out *the cause of this effect,*

Or rather say, *the cause of this defect;*
For *this effect defective comes by cause.*"

In the *Aphorisms* at the beginning of the *Novum Organum*, Bacon says that *where the cause is not known, the effect cannot be produced;* for the *cause* in the process of contemplation is the *effect* in the working; and *the cause of nearly all the defects* is that which we admire the noble faculties of the mind, we neglect to seek for its helps.* If you will be at the pains of examining the 350 cases or so in which Shakespeare uses the word "cause," you will, I am sure, be satisfied that the habit of tracing all events, all effects and defects, to their causes, is as confirmed in the Poet as in the Philosopher.

Then the *aim* and *end* of study, the *purpose* with which it was to be pursued, the *characters* to be written on the memory or employed as means of distinction and recognition; the *order* and *method* by which knowledge and wisdom are to be attained and stored up; the sum and conclusion of each argument or theory; the taking of *notes*, and collecting of *instances*, or examples, are brought before the eyes of our mind in looking at this short list of words. The *parts*, *observation*, *questioning* and *reasoning* faculties, necessary for inquiry into the *Forms of Things;* the true *characters* and *nature*, in *Laws of Nature*, which were in *time* destined to prove themselves one with the laws of God—*truth* in its noblest interpretation—all these great thoughts may be seen in embryo in less than three dozen words.

We are supposed to be addressing "Baconian" students, who have at least read most of the works which they profess to discuss. It may be interesting to them if a few references are added to places in the plays where these very same master-words are used in the same manner and connection:—

"My *thoughts aim* at a further matter."—3 *Hen. VI.* iii. 2. *Othello*, iii, 3, etc.

"Let all the *ends* thou *aims't at* be *thy country's*,
Thy God's, and Truth's."—*Hen. VIII.* iii. 2.

"What is the *end of study?* Let me know."—*Love's Labour's Lost*, i. 1.

"These few precepts in thy memory
See thou *character.*"—*Hamlet*, i. 3.

* Bohn's translation of the *De Augmentis* shows the resemblance of Baconian and Shakespearean diction better than Spedding's more picked phrases. Being away from home, without my books, I am unable to quote from either volume.

"There is a kind of *character* in thy life,
That to the observer doth thy history
Fully unfold."—*Measure for Measure*, i. 1.

Bacon's *Colours of Good and Evil* are seen in such passages as the following :—

Nathaniel. As a certain father saith . . .
Holofernes. Tell me not of the father. *I do feel colourable colours.—Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. 2.

"I must be unjust to Thurio *under the colour* of commending him."—*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iv. 1.

"My course,
. . Holds not *colour* with the time, nor does
The course and required office
On my particular."—*All's Well that Ends Well*, ii. 5.

"A kind of confession . . . which your modesties have not craft enough to cover."—*Hamlet*, ii. 2, etc.

Then, as to "conclusions," the uses are many in the Plays; some are almost too well known for repetition :—

"I knew 'twould be a bald conclusion."—*Comedy of Errors*, ii. 2.
"The blood or baseness of our natures would conduct us to most *preposterous conclusions*."—*Othello*, i. 3. *See also Ib.* i. 1. (15).

"O most lame and impotent *conclusion!* "—*Ib.* ii. 1.

The best examples of "contraries" come, like many of the more remarkable expressions, from the *later* Plays:

"*No contraries hold more antipathy*
Than I and such a knave."—*King Lear*, ii. 2.

Bacon's lucubrations upon "contraries" are, you will remember, much mixed up with reflections on *sympathies and antipathies.*
"Let *piety* and fear" (says Timon, in his imprecations on Athens),

"Religion to the gods, peace, justice, truth,
Domestic awe, night-rest, and neighborhood,
Instruction, manners, mysteries, and trades,
Degrees, observances, customs and laws
Decline to your confounding contraries,
And let confusion live!"— *Timon of Athens*, iv. 1.

And Gonsalo, picturing to his friends the Utopia which he would establish had he "the plantation of this isle," declares that "In the commonwealth, I would *by contraries* execute all things." * His system would have been admirably suited for the production of such a society as Timon desired might be the bane of Athens.

The word *form*, as used by Bacon, has been the subject of some learned discussion, and is evidently considered peculiar if not exceptional. It is concluded to signify the inherent properties of anything, its nature, or characteristic qualities. It does not, in the passages discussed, mean *shape or figure.* Now, in the early and late Plays the same difference is found. In *Love's Labour's Lost* the word occurs in both senses :—

"In what manner? *In manner and form* following . . . it is the manner of a man to speak to a woman ; *for the form, in some form.*" † (For the sake of natural politeness, with some ceremony). "A spirit full of *forms*, figures, shapes, objects," ‡ "Love is, . . . like the eye, full of strange shapes, of habits, and of *forms varying* in subjects."

In this last sentence, after mentioning shapes and habits, (dresses or disguises), the poet would not return to *shapes*—at least so it seems to me—he seems to be using *form* in the sense of *nature*, characteristic or kind. But we get nearer to the sense of *character* or *nature* in *Troilus and Cressida*, where Agamemnon says : "We'll put on *a form of strangeness.*" § This seems very like Hamlet's "*assume a virtue*, if you have it not," feign (or disguise yourself in) *a nature or character* which is not your own ; he seems to be alluding to the varying *habits* of which love of the spirit of a man is in *Love's Labour's Lost* said to be full.

Again, when Thersites racks his brain for insulting epithets to fling at Menelaus, we see that it is the *nature*, or characteristic qualities of the man, for which he would find parallels. After several contemptuous expressions ending with "a thrifty shoeing-horn in a chain, hanging at his brother's leg," he is still dissatisfied with his own powers of vituperation.

"To what *form* but that he is, should wit larded with malice, and malice farced with wit, turn him to? To an ass were nothing : he is both ass and ox ; to an ox were nothing : he is both ox and ass. To be a dog, a mule, a cat, a fitchew, a toad, a lizard, an owl, a puttock, or a herring without a roe, I would not care ; but to be Menelaus—I would conspire against destiny."

* *Tempest.* † i. 2. ‡ *Ib.* iv. 2. § *Troilus and Cressida*, iii. 3.

Certainly here it is not the shape of Menelaus, but his *inherent nature*, which is so obnoxious to the irritable cynic, and Hamlet's description of his father's picture, "a combination and a *form*,

> 'Where every god did set his seal,
> To give the world assurance of a man.'"

seems again to point to the *nature* of the man and not merely to his figure, and the same, I think, in other places where this word is used.

The next word on the list, *instance*, is also a kind of key-note to one part of Bacon's method. Every point of doctrine or teaching should, he says, be illustrated by examples or *instances*. I cannot find that the word was common until he adopted it. But here it is in *Shakespeare*.

We all remember the Justice with his "wise saws and modern *instances*;"* then have Touchstone to the shepherd, who says that "courtesy would be uncleanly if the courtiers were shepherds." "*Instance*, briefly," says Touchstone; "come, *instance*," and when an illustration is given by the shepherd, Touchstone answers: "Shallow, shallow; *a better instance*, I say; come." The shepherd tries again without success, and is again required to "*mend the instance.*"

This word is sometimes apparently almost synonymous both in the prose and Plays with *evidence* or *witness*. As where Troilus exclaims that

> "the spacious breadth of this division
> Admits no orifice for a point as subtle
> As Arachne's broken woof to enter.
> Instance, O instance! strong as Pluto's gates;
> Instance, O instance! strong as Heaven itself.†

It will be observed that from the brief list of Nouns are excluded the immense army of words which are used *figuratively*, and which abound on almost every page, and in every part or form of speech in the writings of Francis St. Alban. The methodical and persistent use of these is due, doubtless, on the one side to the poetical genius and "nimbleness" of mind which made him, as he says, "quick to perceive analogies"—on the other, to his resolution "to mingle Earth and Heaven," to raise men's minds from the contemplation of things material and visible, to sublime conceptions of things immaterial and spiritual—"things beyond the reaches of their souls."

* *As You Like It* ii. 7. † *Tr. Cr.* v. 2.

That such was his aspiration may be seen in his Preface to the *Wisdom of the Ancients*. "All things," he says, "abounded with fables, parables, similes, comparisons and allusions . . . intended to inform and teach whilst the minds of men continued rude and unpractised in speculation, or even impatient and incapable of receiving such things as do not directly fall under, and strike the senses. And if any man would let new light in upon the human understanding, and conquer prejudice without raising opposition he must have recourse to the like method of allegory, metaphor and allusion.

The instilling of truths and new ideas, then, was his primary aim. A second object was the building up of "a noble model of language." It is, at present, impossible to sum up the amount of our debt to him on this score. The 3,000 words accredited to "*Shakespeare*" probably fall far short of those which he imported, adapted, coined, or made current in the ordinary vocabulary of educated men. But, added to these are the innumerable figures which Francis, like Fluellen, found "in all things."

From every object, natural and artificial, every conceivable branch of knowledge these figures were drawn. Horticulture, agriculture and forestry; architecture, sculpture, painting, and music; warfare and navigation, mining, chemistry, magnetism; medicine and surgery, foods, drinks, drugs, poisons, cosmetics, articles of dress, personal ornaments; everything, in short, which his eye had seen, or ear heard, was laid under contribution to furnish similes and allusions for the instruction of mankind, and to enrich his mother-tongue.

We must not be misunderstood, or supposed to claim for our universal author that he *invented* figurative language. This, in the face of his own declaration that he was following the example of antiquity, would be absurd. We need no assurance that he would make full use of everything which he could find to his purpose. Does he not say that he would "Make antiquity for aye his page." The classical poets and the Bible, especially the Psalms of David, abound in metaphors, but, beyond all these, the figurative language of our poet-philosopher overflows and irrigates the arid deserts of learning, clothing them with beauty and plenty too. We hardly realise how poor our rich language would be if we were debarred the use of the all-pervading "Baconisms" which meet us in every page of an ordinary modern book or

newspaper—such expressions as to *beget* doubts, *breed* suspicions, *awaken* animosity, *lull* men into security, *nourish* sciences, *remedy* mistakes, *patch up* quarrels; *aim, level* at, *hunt* after the truth of things; *frame, build up, erect, lay the foundations* of philosophy or science; *furnish* the mind, *sift* truth from error, *call upon* antiquity, *win* belief, *woo* and *win* truth, *tune* the affections, *plant* knowledge, *digest* information, *cultivate* good manners, *fortify* arguments, *embrace* an offer, *undermine* schemes, &c.; or *flowery* speeches, *feverish* haste, *far-fetched* similes, *deadly* dullness, *infectious* errors, *frothy* talk, *shadowy* personages, *stormy* meetings, *intestine* wars, *cheap* compliments, *shallow* arguments, and so forth *ad infinitum.*

The residue of verbs habitually or peculiarly used by our author seems, *when all figurative language is taken out,* to be very small.

To conceive	To feign (poets)	To intend	To protest
„ conclude	„ follow	„ make ado	„ prove
„ confess	„ grant	„ matter	„ question
„ consider	„ incur	„ mean	„ relate
„ define	„ inquire	„ note	„ report
„ distinguish	„ infer	„ occasion	„ say
„ double	„ insinuate	„ profess	„ second

The phrases "I have heard say," "They say," "It is reported," &c., are among the turns of speech which according to "Bacon's" own instructions for writing or speaking, provide means of honourable retreat in cases where statements are doubtful, or to be set down with caution.

There are also many verbs formed from nouns and adjectives, such as to brazen, to beggar, to dead, to dull, to dog, to horse, to malice, to motion, to lord, to queen, to stomach, to foot, to pen, and so forth.

Adjectives, adverbs, and abverbial phrases may be taken together.

A kind of. This is another protective phrase to be found hundreds of times in *Bacon* and *Shakespeare.*

Absolute. "An absolute monarch," &c.

All in all.

Amiss	Colourable	Excellent, excelling
Apt, unapt	Contrariwise	Exquisite
As for	(or on the contrary)	Fit, unfit, &c.
As is	Corporeal	Forth, so far forth
As it were	Deformed	General, generalites
By reason of	Due	Idle (vain)
Certain	Empty words, &c.	If

Lame, lamely	Notable	Sole
Less, no less	Particular	Stiff
Manifest	Peradventure	Strange
Mean (time)	Perpetual	Sure
Mere	Poor (of abilities, &c.	Thousand
Monied (man)	Proper (man)	True
Nay (as affirmative)	Questionable	Truly
Nothing less, else	Rather (the)	Utter (ly)
Not, unlike	Reasonable	Vast
Neither (beginning of sentence)	Real (ly)	Wholesome
No, not	Round	
	Seasonable, &c.	

Certain adjectives are found with "Bacon" to run in double harness, and it is the same with other parts of speech—thus flat and dull, dull and dead, flat and dead, vain and idle, vain and empty, vain and fantastic, aim and level, rage and roar, &c. But oftener still words are coupled (so it seems) in order that the elder word may bring in the little shy new word by the hand. The new word is sometimes pushed in first, at other times the old word speaks for, and interprets it; or when both are newly introduced into polite society, they seem to support and comfort each other, "aid and assist," "base and ignoble," "an ambiguous or double use," "advice drier and purer," "divulged and spread abroad," "extirpated and abolished," "infused and drenched," "piercing and corrosive," "sad and pensive," "renovation and restoration," "puzzle and perplex," "vecture or carriage," "witty and sharp," "talk or discourse," "common and popular," "fire and combustion," &c.

But often we cannot fail to perceive that "the mind is coupled with the words" and that one word instantly suggests another in a way that absolutely identifies the writer; for although one man might servilely copy the vocabulary of another, he never could appropriate the innermost suggestions of another man's imagination. We *know* (although it is a matter impossible to be entered into in this small space) that with Francis "Bacon" thoughts and remembrance were ever fitted. When, therefore, we meet with such associations of words and peculiar ideas as, "a weak foundation" (or strong) "cause and effect," "nature and art," "thought free," "money dirt," "blue violets," "wild thyme," "silver waves" (water, &c), "familiar and household words," "swelling pride," "lost labour," "death once," "fame eternized," and such like, we feel as sure that we are communing with that

mighty spirit as if he sat beside us in the flesh, dictating his own words.

Besides the habitual use of certain words, the introduction of provincial and old English words (which he evidently studied not only from the dialect of country people, but from the poems of Chaucer), and the many French, and a few Italian and Spanish words learnt abroad, besides the coupling, and metaphorical uses of these words, and the innumerable uses to which they were turned in puns and quibbling allusions,* there are other tricks of style by which, as by the tone of the voice, or by some familiar gesture we recognise our hidden friend. Amongst these are *alliterations*, which in youth he seems to have used almost to excess, and which he accordingly satirises in the person of the Pedant Holofernes, where he is made to say "*I will affect the letter, for it argues facility. 'The preyful princess pierced and pricked a pretty pleasing pricket,'*" *&c.*† But although his mature taste rejected as "affectation" this excess of alliteration, his musical ear, and sense of pleasant smoothness in the composition of sentences, seem to have combined to make him fall naturally and habitually upon combinations of harmonious and alliterative words. Again we may surely "smell him out by that." Poetry and prose alike abound with alliterations.

"*B*y *b*reaking of the *b*and *b*etwixt us twain."
"*L*esser *L*ights in *L*ight excel."
"*S*wimming in a *S*ea of blissful joy."
"*F*ollow *the f*ooting *of thy f*eet."
"*T*o *st*int all *st*rif*e* and *fost*er *f*riendly peace."
"*S*poke without stop or staggering."
"The same *col*oured *cl*oth and a *cl*ay *col*oured *cap*."
"It *d*oth *d*amp and *d*ull in*d*ustries." "*F*air and *F*oul."
"The for*ce* of *C*ustom *C*opulate, and *C*onjoined, and *C*ollegiate . . . *C*ompany *C*omforteth."
"To *m*end the *m*usic."
"*F*ictions and *F*ancies."
"*S*ome *str*an*ge* ch*anges*, some sweet odours *s*uddenly coming forth."
"The *prec*epts of *P*allas . . . the *pr*esum*pti*on of *P*an."
"This *f*irst *f*ruit *of f*riendship."
"*S*ecret swelling of *s*eas."
"*I*nwardly *i*nfect," &c.

* As we now find for purposes of Cipher-writing and Jargon.
† *Love's Labour Lost* iv. 2.

There are also the repetitions and pleonasms as "Many *causeless caused* to be blamed." "*Great* cause to give *great* thanks," "but, for my will, my will is," "as for her wish, her wish was." "I doubt if any doubt remain," &c. "Shakespeare" readers will recall endless examples, but we must hurry to an end, and for the many peculiarities in the grammar which "Bacon" was fitting to our language, refer to the standard work by Dr. Abbott, written to furnish students of Shakespeare and Bacon with a short systematic account of some points of difference between Elizabethan syntax and our own. It is equally valuable in enabling us to trace the points of resemblance between the "Baconian" works themselves.

Sufficient notice has not, so far as we are aware, been taken of the highly antithetical style of "Baconian" writings of the perpetual tendency to inspect both sides of every question, and ever to balance the contraries of good and evil. Seldom do we turn a page without coming across such couplings of contraries as these :—*Hot and Cold, Life Death, Putrefaction Germination, Sweet sour, Particulars Generals, Wise Fool, the Beautiful Deformed and the Deformed Beautiful, Wholesome Iniquity, Poor in desiring Riches, Mount high to fall low, A plentiful lack, Fair Foul, &c.* Surely it is true that, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and who that has listened will not recognise the voice?

The frequent *Questions* are another characteristic of "Bacon's" style, a method of suggestive instruction which he commends. We may then fairly class it amongst the indications to be looked for of his authorship. This paper is already too long, and yet nothing has been said of his *poetry*, or of his "*style*" as a whole. With regard to the first of these, it cannot be properly discussed until it has been decided *which poems were his.* To judge of his powers as a poet by a few "*Translations of certain Psalms,*" said to have been written upon a bed of sickness, is futile, and merely suggestive of a desire to shelve the question. Those Psalms were some attempts to adapt the songs of David to music, to be sung for the first time in English, in our churches. Of these verses it has been the custom to speak contemptuously, but this has probably been done in order to lower the estimation of our poet. James Spedding, no mean critic, and a very calm one, although considering Francis only as "an unpractised versifier," has these words about the Psalms in question: "**. . . The translation serves for a kind of poetical commentary (on the original) . . . and holds up a light to read it by.**

For myself at least I may say that, deeply pathetic as the opening of the 137th Psalm always seemed to me, I have found it more affecting since I read Bacon's paraphrase of it . . . I infer from this sample that Bacon had all the natural faculties which a poet wants: a fine ear for metre, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion. . . . The truth is that Bacon was not without the 'fine frenzy' of the poet" &c.*

For our own part we may rest content with the verdict of "Ben Jonson," whose word having been taken as Gospel with regard to "*Shakespeare*," cannot well be discredited with regard to "Bacon:" "*It is he who hath filled up all numbers, and done that in our time which may be either compared or preferred to insolent Greece* or haughty Rome. . . . Now things daily fall, wits grow downward, and eloquence grows backward, so that he may be named, and stand as the mark or acmè of our language."

In conclusion we hope that no one professing to join in our hunt after truth, will bestride the lame argument that the presence of these things:—enormous vocabulary, imported and coined words, peculiar turns of speech, ideas coupled, figurative language, habitual uses of words, tricks of speech, grammatical peculiarities, and so on (not to mention the "*fixed notions*" which appear throughout the Baconian writings)—that these things, occurring in works passing under different names, proclaim themselves to have been common and popular, "in the air"—"familiar in men's mouth's as household words." Such an assumption would amount to saying that when "Bacon" classed these particulars amongst the "deficients" or as parts of his new method, he did not know what he was talking about. It would be tantamount to saying that the time-honoured company of Shakespearean Commentators and Critics who have based their system of verbal criticism upon such points are equally at fault—in short that verbal criticism and philological evidence are alike valueless. This would indeed be "a lame and impotent conclusion!" Let none of us be content to rest upon it.

Q.

---

* See Spedding's *Works of Bacon*, vii. 265—272.

MY CRITIC.—A REJOINDER.

IN the July, 1901, issue of BACONIANA, appears an article written by me, and entitled: "The Biliteral Cipher Story Examined," and in the same issue appears "A Reply," written by Mrs. Pott. This reply I did not see till it was published. By request of the Committee, I now confine my answer to the most salient points.

1. I expressly disclaimed attacking Mrs. Gallup's "probity," and tried to explain how I thought her mistakes arose. My critic, with marks of quotation, makes out that I have "laid the specific charge against Mrs. Gallup of 'imitating' Bacon's English." This is not quite fair. I did not use the word "imitating," and *it does not express my meaning.* On the contrary, it is my opinion that if Mrs. Gallup knew Bacon in his published works well, and had *consciously intended* to imitate him, her story would have assumed a very different shape.

2. No legitimate question whatever arises as to the frequent or sparing use of *its.* Mrs. Pott misunderstands the argument. The question is (i) when *its* was first used, (ii) when *its* began to be in familiar use, (iii) when *his,* where we use *its,* died out altogether. The first discovered instance of the use of *its* is in 1598, Florio. *Its* began to supplant *his* freely about 20 years afterwards. *His* for *its* has not been found later than 1670, except when an archaic style is adopted, My critic's illustrations of the use of *its* from Crashaw (who wrote about 1646), Cotton (b. 1630), Thomas Browne (b. 1605), Andrew Marvell (b. 1620), and so much the more of all later writers, are wholly beside the mark. I suggest to her that she is entirely in error when she writes: "Such results repeatedly obtained tend to shew that the writer, or writers, after about 1595, used or discarded *its* as they pleased, and as good taste suggested." I ask her to give an instance of *its* before 1598, or "repeated" instances before 1620. I should be surprised if she finds a dozen in all. The earliest ones are in Florio. In his "Montaigne" of 1603,* *its* has been discovered five times—not three, as I regret I wrote in error. But it must be added that I have found *his* in this edition many times where we use *its.* If my critic has discovered other instances

* There are three folio editions of Florio's "Montaigne"—1603, 1613, 1632. My critic quotes from an edition of 1605, but I expect that this is a printer's error, as there seems to be no such an edition. The 1632 edition is too late for my purpose.

of *its* in the editions 1603, or 1613, it will increase the sum of our knowledge in a little point of some interest connected with the growth of language.

3. I wrote:—"From a very cursory examination [of the story], I find *its* as follows—Pages 27 (three times), 38, 41 (three times), 42, 56, 159 (twice), 210, 254." A little addition soon accounts here for thirteen *its* in a few pages taken *at random*.* Now observe what my critic asserts that I said:—"In the 'Bacon of Mrs. Gallup,' Mr. Candler finds *its* as follows—pp. 27, *thrice;* 33, 42, 159, *twice;* 210 and 254, *four* times—in all, nine times." The reader will perceive that Mrs. Pott inserts, in quoting from me, "33" and "four times," and omits "38," "41 (three times)," and "56." There is manifestly some further mistake or printer's error to account for her own "nine times." In a note she adds:—"There seems to be no *its* on p. 33, or on any page from 27 to 42" (an error, as there are four instances between pp. 27 and 42); and she twice suggests that what I have discovered in *a few pages as samples of a characteristic style of writing* is *all that occurs in a book of* 360 *pages!*

4. But there is worse to come. Mrs. Pott writes:—"Doubtless the critic examined, as he says, more than 100 pages of Bacon [for the word *its*], but he examined the wrong 100 pages." Now will it be easily believed that my critic, to show that I am in error, *does not quote one single instance* of *its* in Bacon's published works, but quotes many instances of *its* in a work *not written by Bacon?* Bacon wrote *De Sapientia Veterum* in 1609. He did *not* write "The Wisdom of the Ancients." It is true that there were three translations of Bacon's Latin work. But when they were written and by whom (other than Bacon) is nothing to my purpose as regards Bacon's use of the word *its*. My critic gives no date. If the date of her edition is before 1620 it would be very interesting, but it would prove nothing that would avail her argument. If later, it would not even be interesting.

5. I am not sure that I understand Mrs. Pott rightly that she has found the expression, "surcease of sorrow," in Montaigne and Marlowe. If this is so, others besides myself would be glad if she would indicate the passages.

H. CANDLER.

*** I am told my addition is not clear, though the punctuation makes it so. Pp. 27 and 41 each account for *three*, p. 159 for *two*, five more pages each for *one*. In all thirteen.**

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF *THE MORNING POST.*

DEAR SIR,—In the *Morning Post* of the 5th inst., appears an article by Mr. Andrew Lang, the four-quarter educated, entitled, "The Madness of Francis Bacon," and purporting to be a critique of Mrs. Gallup's book, "The Bi-literal Cipher of Sir Francis Bacon." This is the second occasion on which Mr. Lang has favoured the public with a notice of the work. Now mark the immense advantage conferred by those last three-quarters of education. Anyone of us "quarter-educated" would have considered it necessary to read a book before making criticisms on it. Mr. Lang candidly acknowledges in his first notice that he had not read it. However, he has done so now, but still the ordinary reader is nowhere under the fire at his 75th educational artillery. Indeed, he seems to have discovered, and captured for his own, a sort of fourth dimension of criticism, for he is not only able to find things implied, which certainly no one else could find implied, but even to quote verbatim from Mrs. Gallup's work, a passage which is not there.

The article is written in Mr. Lang's wittiest and most amusing style, and therein lies the danger. Mr. Lang's name carries weight. It is one to "conjure with," but not to juggle with; and it is the juggling that forms a prominent feature of the article which calls for protest. I quote a few examples. "She (Elizabeth) tried to cause him (Leicester) to marry Mary Queen of Scots." What does the cipher story say?

"Whilst, to leave out their stage play, until their parts should be done, Her Majesty, most like some loud player, proclaim'd Baron Dudley, Earle of Leicester, suitor to Mary, Queen of Scots." Words could not make it plainer that Elizabeth did *not* mean to marry Leicester to Mary. Again, "The secret of Bacon's birth was most carelessly guarded," and a line or two farther on, Mr. Lang speaks of this "story so generally known," quoting bits of a passage in such a way as to give the idea that the cipher story speaks of a large number of people who knew and talked of the secret. The fact is that, according to the story, a Maid of Honour blurted out the secret before Cecil and Bacon in Elizabeth's presence, and that she in a rage acknowledged the truth of it. On this Francis went to his reputed mother, Lady Anne Bacon, who, again in private, corroborated the story, and advised him to go for further confirmation to the doctor and the midwife, two persons who must of necessity have been in the secret. So that, besides the few, who from its nature were bound to know it, and those immediately concerned there were two who knew it, Cecil and the Maid of Honour, and they would have had the most obvious reasons for taking good care not to divulge it. I leave your readers to judge whether a criticism is fair, which speaks as though it were a *secret de polichinelle.* Take another passage, "All his 'maskes,' Shakespeare, Peele, Greene, and so on, could have blackmailed Bacon to any extent. But we are not told that they did." We are not told that they did not. We are told, however (*e.g.* on pages 53, 77, and 81), that some of them sold their names. Shakespeare, at last, retired very rich; perhaps he did blackmail Bacon.

A little further on Mr. Lang says, "If I understand him, he really had a high opinion of Shakespeare. He says, 'The next volume will be under Shakespeare's name. As some which have now been produced have borne

on the title page his name, though all are my own work, I have allowed it to stand on many others, which I myself regard as equal in merit.' Apparently Bacon thought many of Shakespeare's plays as good as his own." It is obvious that Bacon here makes no allusion to any plays of Shakespeare's.

But the climax is reached at the end of the article, where Mr. Lang quotes as part of Mrs. Gallup's cipher story, in order to hold it up to ridicule, a passage from another work (Dr. Owen's), which has nothing whatever to do with the bi-literal cipher, but of which a sample page (the source of Mr. Lang's quotation) is inserted at the end of the volume as a publisher's advertisement.

We Baconians court criticism; but let us have criticism and not garbling. But perhaps we should excuse Mr. Lang. His brain was reeling, he tells us. Let us trust that it will have recovered its balance before he reviews another book.

I am, dear sir,

Faithfully yours,

FLEMING FULCHER.

[NOTE.—This letter was sent to the *Morning Post* the day after Mr. Lang's critique appeared. It was not inserted.]

FALSTAFF AND EQUITY: A REVIEW.*

BY A LAWYER.

[Reprinted from June No. *Cram's Magazine.*]

JUDGE PHELPS takes for his text Falstaff's expression, "There's no equity stirring." (1 *Hen. IV.* II. 2). "An the Prince and Poins be not two arrant cowards, there's no equity stirring;" and he deduces from it that there is proof that the writer of the play, namely, William Shakespeare (*i.e.*, Shaksper), of Stratford, was an expert in the use of legal terms. On p. 14 we read: "Beyond all question he was a well-informed contemporary of Ellesmere, of Coke, and of Bacon. `He was an appreciative witness of the great contest between the courts of law and equity, in which these men acted conspicuous parts. He had doubtless heard the merits of the controversy discussed many times in the well-informed circles to which he had access. . . . Why should he have preferred the word 'equity' to 'justice?' Why should he have chosen such a word as 'stirring?'—a term often suggestive of something more than mere activity or alertness, and in a frequent sense pregnant with the idea of agitation, excitement, intensity?" On p. 22, "The personal acerbity and bitterness which flavoured the quarrel Shakespeare (Shaksper) may be supposed to have thoroughly appreciated. The exciting personal incidents which from time to time punctuated its progress were as familiar to him as to the entire legal profession and the intelligent public."

On p. 26: "We all know what material composed the audiences who crowded to hear Falstaff. Shakespeare's reputation was at this time

* "Falstaff and Equity: An Interpretation." By Charles E. Phelps, Judge Supreme Bench, Baltimore. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1901.

(1596) made; he had attracted the notice of the queen, he was in the fashion." Mr. Phelps thinks it may be doubted whether Lord Coke was of the audience; but, "it would be safe to assume the presence of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere;" and that there is "no special reason for supposing the absence of Popham, Croke, Dodridge, or Crew, or Montague, or Yelverton, or even Bacon himself." He thinks that Falstaff may have slyly winked at one of these learned persons when he spoke of "no equity stirring," to the great amusement of the audience.

On p. 87 we read: "The expert use of professional legal terminology was as familiar to him (Shakespeare) as his garter; and the author quotes the late Senator Davis, "The Law in Shakespeare," that there are passages where, to carry out some conception to "the finest lines and features of the thought, to push some conceit to the remotest extravagances, so that it is necessary for a well-read lawyer to make special investigation into the law and statutes of the time before he can follow it, Shakespeare exhausts the capacity of the terms he employs."

Now, how does Judge Phelps account for William Shakespeare's familiarity with legal terms and processes, as shown by the plays of William Shakespeare? In this way, p. 95: "Every petty borough had its court of record, Stratford as well as the rest. The presiding judge was the mayor of the corporation, or an equivalent functionary called the bailiff." John Shakespeare, on 4th Sept., 1568, was chosen High-bailiff, and held that position one year. He had begun at the bottom, being an illiterate man, as Halliwell-Phillipps tells ("absolutely illiterate"), who, "for some years subsequent to his removal to Stratford, was an humble tradesman" in the borough. As William was born in April, 1564, he was four and a half years old when the father became bailiff, and five and a half at the end of the term. On p. 98: "Little Will Shakespeare (sic) shrewdly took in the animated talk at the family table over his father's promotion to the judicial dignity of High-bailiff. . . . We may be sure that a bright morning came when his father made an era in his young life by taking his little hand and leading the future dramatist to the drama of real life, as enacted in a court room. . . . There is no reason to assume that such a boy as Shakespeare must have been, to be the father of the man, would have failed to use his tongue and his ears as well as his eyes; or that by dint of pertinacious questioning he did not gradually succeed in extracting from his father so much as his father was able to tell him, and that was considerable, of the real meaning of 'those wise saws and modern instances,' the legal forms and terms of art he so often heard repeated." P. 103: "The practical education of the youthful poet by his father and his father's court may be called Shakespeare's elementary law-school." Besides this experience, John Shakespeare "was actively connected with some forty odd law-suits, most of them in the Stratford court of records, most of them cases for small amounts, in which he figured either as plaintiff or defendant."

Moreover, there was a suit in chancery, Shakespeare v. Lambert, for the recovery of some fifty acres of land at Asbies, and a lease to one Gibbs connected with it; which enabled William "to experience another course in the school of conveyances and the learning of fines; and still another in the management of the lawsuit between his parents and Lambert upon both sides of Westminster Hall."

This Stratford court of records "was sufficient to initiate him into much

of the technique of the profession, and to familiarize him with the legal images, the terms and conceits which so richly stud the plays and poems;" (which, I may add, it requires 285 pages under 312 headings in Senator Davis' book to state and explain.)

Judge Phelps' statement alone is enough to refute his argument. Stratford was a stagnant inland town of about 1,800 inhabitants, when William Shakspeare was born. It consisted mainly of humble cottages built with mud walls and thatched roofs. Dr. Johnson tells us that "the English nation, in the time of Shakespeare, was yet struggling to emerge from barbarity. Literature was confined to professed scholars, or to men and women of high rank. The public was gross and dark." John Shaksper was one of this public. All his ancestors and all his relatives had been, and were illiterate, and the same was true as to Mary Arden, John's wife. It may be supposed that the burgesses and aldermen of Stratford were among the most prominent men of the borough, yet of nineteen of these officials whose names are appended to a document copied by Phillips, thirteen signed with a mark and one of these is John "Shaksper." Mr. Phillips, the great authority for the facts of William Shakspeare's life, says that when William was a boy there were few persons in Stratford "capable of initiating him into the horn-book and the A. B. C." He also says that books were then of very rare occurrence, and that outside of Bibles and education manuals there were not more than two or three dozen books in all Stratford. There was a free school, but there is no proof that William attended it even for one day. During all his youth the school was taught by a single teacher, at a stipend of £20 per year, as is evidenced by the payments recorded in the account of the borough. It was therefore a small school, and the great majority of the householders evidently did not take advantage of it, John Shakespeare as likely as any other. There is no evidence that William Shakespeare, at any time in his life, ever owned a book or ever read one, or ever spoke of books. In his last Will, there was no mention of library or library furniture, or of books or of plays either in print or manuscript, and yet his Will was of great particularity. So also there is no evidence that this man ever learned to write, or was able even to write his own name. There are five assumed signatures of William Shakespeare, and that is all that exists claimed to have come from his hand. But the five show that no two are alike. They were written by five different persons, and it is more than doubtful if even one of them was from the pen of Shakespeare.

John Shakespeare was a butcher. He had been a tenant of Robert Arden, and eventually married that farmer's daughter. This gave him some recognition in the borough of Stratford, where he had lived as "a humble tradesman," and the same year of his marriage, 1557, he was elected to the office of ale-taster. His neighbours doubtless could trust him to determine on the quality of ale. In 1558, he was promoted to the honour of Constable. After three years of that office, he was chosen Chamberlain of the borough, whose business was to keep the accounts. Phillipps, speaking of John and his predecessor, says: "Neither of these worthies could even write their names," but nearly all tradesmen then reckoned with counters, the results on important occasions being entered by professional scriveners. In 1568, John was chosen High Bailiff. This officer exercised limited magisterial powers about equal to those of a rural Justice of the Peace in the United States. Mr. Phelps speaks of him as a judge, but this implies a vastly

higher rank than attached to the office of Bailiff. Justice is the proper word. What sort of a magistrate a Justice of the Peace, if illiterate and among illiterate people, makes, is too well known to need remark. Such Justices have been a laughing stock from time immemorial for their incapacity and blunders. To talk of the High Bailiff of Stratford initiating his boy into the technique of law, and explaining to him legal terms and processes, seems rather wild. And to suppose that a boy four or five years old would discover an interest in legal matters so that his dad's court was the boy's "elementary law-school" is a bit wilder. And to claim that the lawsuits of litigious John Shakespeare, in Stratford, or concerning the land at Asbies, gave the writer "Shakespeare" the expert knowledge of law shown in the plays is the wildest guess of all.

Judge Phelps shows that the expression "no equity stirring" is used in three senses. 1st, In the Bible sense of justice; 2nd, in the judicial sense of the equity of the court of chancery; and 3rd, in the professional sense of an equitable cause of action; and that in the expression of Falstaff the word equity is used in all three of these senses at once, (page 11). And it is noted that this sounds very much indeed like Francis Bacon. "It may be worth notice that the same word 'stirring' is repeatedly used by Lord Bacon in precisely the same connection, and applies to precisely the same subject matter. "I did not fail in my conjecture," writes Bacon, "that this business of the chancery hath stirred him." Again; "If any of the puisne judges did stir this business, I think that judge worthy to lose his place." Again Bacon notices that "this business of the chancery had stirred Ellesmere." Page 62, "It is upon parallelisms of thought and expression like that cited, many of which may be found in the writings of Bacon and Shakespeare, that the work of the dramatist has been attributed to the philosopher. . . . If Bacon, the jurist, is admitted to be the author of the plays, the use of the word 'equity' in its judicial sense instantly becomes too obvious to talk about. The strongest point for the cipher theory is made upon this play, and upon this very act, in which occurs the expression 'no equity stirring.' The striking repetition of the word *bacon*, the remarkably frequent repetition of the word *Francis*, the introduction of the word *Nicholas* (the name of Francis Bacon's father) and the introduction of the word *equity*, (Nicholas having also been chancellor) are certainly curious coincidences with the mysterious expression: 'We have the receipt of fern-seed, *we walk invisible*.'" When, in addition to all this, we find the word equity here properly used in its technical sense, just as any lawyer would have used it, and with reference to the very controversy in which Bacon afterwards became a prominent actor, it must be concluded that the array is altogether too formidable to be treated with contempt."

Judge Phelps here says enough to satisfy the writer of this paper that between the two men, Bacon and William Shakespeare, the odds are prodigiously in favour of Bacon as the writer of the plays in question, and therefore of all the Shakespeare plays; but the Judge cannot get over "the stubborn fact of the dissimilarity of style." Not one of the publications cited, marvellous though they may be supposed as coincidences of thought and expression, nor all of them together, can satisfy the unbiased mind that the philosopher possessed the trick of the dramatist, and that it was possible for Bacon to have produced Falstaff, any more than it was possible for Shakespeare (Shaksper) to have produced the *Novum Organum*.

Let us look into the matter. That William Shakespeare, of Stratford, was incapable of writing any one of the Shakespeare plays has been conclusively shown by several authors. He was a clown at the public theatres, the Curtain and the Globe, and the larger part of his theatrical career was spent strolling with his company over all England. The public theatre was the most debased place of amusement in London, frequented by the rabble, thieves, sharpers, pimps and prostitutes. Professor Barrett Wendall says: "The Elizabethan theatre of 1587 was not a socially respectable place." Dr. Howard Furness, in his Variorum Edition of *Much Ado*, quotes a passage from a contemporary writer in which players and cutpurses are bracketed together, and he remarks: "This shows the catalogue in which Shakespeare (Shaksper) and his fellow-players were put, and the estimate in which they were held socially by well-bred gentlemen like Fynes Morrison." Decent people did not go to the public theatres, nor did such people consort with players.

Therefore, when Judge Phelps assumes that Judges and Chancellors, "Even Bacon himself," went to the public theatre to see Falstaff, he is altogether without support, much more when he brings in that old chestnut about the Queen noticing player Shakespeare. Richard Grant White names a score of contemporaries of eminence in their professions and in literature, headed by Raleigh, Spenser, Sidney, and Bacon, and says: "There is no proof whatever that he (Shakespeare) was personally known to either of these men or to any of less note among the statesmen, scholars, and artists of his day except the few of his fellow craftesmen." Nor was any such man as William Shakespeare known to the contemporaries of player William Shakespeare, 1587-1616. No one said in those years that the two names represented the same individual. Dr. J. C. Ingleby, who spent years in search of mentions of or allusions to William Shakespeare, the writer of the plays, and whose *Centurie of Prayse* is the highest authority on that matter, sums up: "It is plain that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age." No one said he had seen him, or spoken to him, or that he knew who this Shakespeare was. Such being the state of things, it is plain that some unknown writer was masquerading under the name of "William Shakespeare." For nearly three hundred years, the world has credited William Shakespeare, player, with the authorship of the plays on no evidence whatever; but within the last few decades search has been made for the real author.

In the first place, this author was a practising lawyer, eminent in the profession; in the next place he was well educated in all the learning of the day, used Latin as a mother-tongue, thought in Latin, and constantly coined new words from the Latin *currente calamo*, to express his thought. He was just as accomplished in French and Italian; had travelled extensively on the continent; was an adept in philosophy; possessed the gift of oratory to a remarkable degree; was a gentleman by birth and breeding, familiar with high life as well as with Courts. Besides this, he employed a vast vocabulary, exceeding that of any of his contemporaries, except Francis Bacon.

Play-writing was in the air, in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Dr. George Brandes tell us that: "Every Englishman of Elizabeth's time could write a tolerably good play, as every European to-day can write a passable newspaper article."

Senator Davis tells us that "the affiliation between the disciples of

Themis and Thespis was a marked feature of those times Many students of law forsook it and became dramatists."

Now, as it is plain that the writer of these plays was one of these lawyers, who had gone over to the dramatists, it ought not to be a difficult matter to discover who he was. Who of the lawyers possessed the characteristics that are so notable in the plays? Who employed a vocabulary as extensive as that of "William Shakespeare?" Who was learned in every branch of knowledge? Who was accustomed to polite society and the usages of Courts? One man stands out prominently, the greatest Englishman intellectually who ever lived, Francis Bacon, and he is the only one who has been suggested as equal to writing these plays, and he was thoroughly equipped for the work.

But, says Judge Phelps, Bacon was incapable of writing poetry, his style was different from Shakespeare's. What is Shakespeare's style? The works on English literature assert that Shakespeare wrote in twenty styles.

Bacon was ranked as a poet by his contemporaries, and has been ranked as such by modern writers quite competent to pronounce on the matter. Macaulay tells us that "The poetical faculty was powerful in Bacon's mind. . . . Much of his life was passed in a visionary world. . . . In wit, if by wit be meant the power of perceiving analogies between things which appear to have nothing in common, he never had an equal—not even Cowley—not even the author of Hudibras." Does it not seem quite impossible that such a man could have written the play of *Henry IV.*

Sir E. L. Bulwer, in 1836, wrote in the *Edinburgh Review*: "We have only to open the *Advancement of Learning* to see how the Attic bees clustered about the cradle of the new Philosophy. Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned in the majestic sentences of the wisest of mankind."

Shelley says: "Lord Bacon was a Poet. His language has a sweet and majestic rhyme which satisfies the senses. Plato exhibited the rare unison of close and subtle logic with Pythian enthusiasm of poetry. . . . Bacon is, perhaps, the only man who can be compared with him."

Taine says: "Shakespeare and the seers do not contain more expressive condensations, more resembling inspiration; in Bacon they are to be found everywhere."

"No author can be compared with him unless it be Shakespeare" (Prof. Dowden, "Life of Bacon").

"He was a genius second only to Shakespeare" (Prof. Church).

"Every page of the *Advancement of Learning*, even of the *Novum Organum*, of the *Wisdom of the Ancients*, of the *Meditationes Sacrae*, give indications of the most exuberant fancy and imagination. . . . Bacon is pre-eminently a Poet, whatever else he may be" (R. M. Theobald).

Judge Phelps has a curious explanation of the source of knowledge of diseases of the mind discovered by the writer of these plays, to wit, Stratford Shakespeare. He tells us that diseased patients were confined in gaol and boarded with the gaoler; and that the High-Bailiff was ex-officio the gaoler. Therefore, as John Shakespeare was Bailiff between 4th Sept., 1564, and 4th Sept., 1565, when boy William was four to five years old, the boy had a grand opportunity to study all phases of mental aberration.

To be sure, he says (p. 105), that there is no direct written evidence that William ever showed the slightest interest in his father's gaol, or that insane patients were at any time lodged in John's house or boarded at

his table. Yet there is "a general presumption from a prevalent custom, and coupled with that presumption the phenomenon of an exhaustive and exact psychological knowledge (in the plays) so remarkable that the conclusion is irresistible that in the words of Dr. Bucknill, "Abnormal conditions of mind had attracted Shakespeare's diligent observation, and had been his favourite study." (This seems to me a remarkable piece of logic).

Now the records of the borough of Stratford during John Shakespeare's career are in existence, and have been searched repeatedly for items concerning all the Shakespeares. Not a word is said of a goal, or of John Shakespeare's keeping a goal, or of his boarding the insane patients, nor was a penny paid John by the Borough for such labour and care. John's house was inadequate for the purpose of a goal, or for taking boarders. R. G. White pronounced it as being "hardly equal to a rustic cottage, almost a hovel, poverty-stricken, squalid, kennel-like." John reared a large family, and his rooms, small and few, were overcrowded by his own children. This explanation by Judge Phelps, then, is no better than the other, and neither is sufficient.

TO BE ENQUIRED.

I SHALL be glad to learn whether any readers of BACONIANA have ever come across the fact that Queen Elizabeth kept Essex's head in a box after his death, and constantly mourned over it? I want to trace the tradition.

WHO was "Hugh Saunders of Merton College, Oxford, *alias* Shackspear?" Anthony Wood says he was "afterwards Principal of St. Alban's Hall."

IN a most interesting book by Fred Lake Williams (1822), "An Historical and Topographical Description of Ancient Verulam," he says that Francis S. Alban wrote a letter "in his retirement" to "Father Fulzentio, the Venetian," on his travels. Who was he? Where is it?

A. A. L.